The Communist

10c. JANUARY 1940

LENIN'S BEQUEST FULFILLED BY STALIN

(Review of the Month)

ROOSEVELT, THE WAR, AND THE NEW DEAL

GENE DENNIS

LENIN ON "THE UNITED STATES OF EUROPE"

WILLIAM GREEN RECONSTRUCTS LABOR HISTORY

WILLIAM Z. FOSTER

THE OHIO RELIEF CRISIS

JOHN WILLIAMSON

ANTI-CAPITALIST SENTIMENT IN GERMANY

W. ULBRICHT

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

WORKS OF V. I. LENIN

Selected Works, 12 Volumes, each $2.00

The Prerequisites of the First Russian Revolution (1894-1899), Vol. I
The Struggle for the Bolshevik Party (1900-1904), Vol. II
The Revolution of 1905-1907, Vol. III
The Years of Reaction and the New Revival (1908-1914), Vol. IV
Imperialism and the Imperialist War (1914-1917), Vol. V
From the Bourgeois to the Proletarian Revolution, Vol. VI
After the Seizure of Power (1917-1918), Vol. VII
The Period of "War Communism" (1918-1920), Vol. VIII
The New Economic Policy (1921-1923), Vol. IX
The Communist International, Vol. X
The Theoretical Principles of Marxism, Vol. XI
Theory of the Agrarian Question, Vol. XII

Collected Works, 8 Volumes, $8.00

The Iskra Period, 2 Volumes; Materialism and Empirio-Criticism; The Imperialist War; The Revolution of 1917, 2 Volumes; Toward the Seizure of Power, 2 Volumes.

Other Works by Lenin

Lenin on Britain $2.00
Marx, Engels, Marxism 1.25
The Russian Revolution, by V. I. Lenin and Joseph Stalin 2.00

•

Write for Free List of Works of Marx, Engels, Lenin and Stalin

•

WORKERS LIBRARY PUBLISHERS
P. O. Box 148, Station D, New York, N. Y.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

VOL. XIX, No. 1 JANUARY, 1940

THE COMMUNIST

A MAGAZINE OF THE THEORY AND PRACTICE OF MARXISM-LENINISM
PUBLISHED MONTHLY BY THE COMMUNIST PARTY OF THE U.S.A.
EDITOR: EARL BROWDER

CONTENTS

Review of the Month	*A. B.*	3
The United States of Europe Slogan	*V. I. Lenin*	17
Roosevelt, the War, and the New Deal	*Gene Dennis*	21
Anti-Capitalist Sentiment in Germany	*W. Ulbricht*	41
On Bourgeois and Bourgeois-Democratic Revolutions	*Emilian Yaroslavsky*	49
Anti-Trust Laws and the Attack on Labor	*Harry Martel*	58
The Ohio Relief Crisis	*John Williamson*	67
The History of the C.P.S.U. and the Propagation of Marxism-Leninism in the World Communist Movement		73
Book Reviews	*William Z. Foster.* *Theodore Miller*	85

Entered as second class matter November 2, 1927, at the Post Office at New York, N. Y., under the Act of March 3, 1879. Send checks, money orders and correspondence to THE COMMUNIST, *P. O. Box 148, Sta. D (50 E. 13th St.), New York. Subscription rates: $2.00 a year; $1.00 for six months; foreign and Canada $2.50 a year. Single copies 20 cents.*

PRINTED IN THE U.S.A.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

NEW PAMPHLETS OF WORLD SIGNIFICANCE!

The U.S.S.R. and Finland
Historical, Economic, Political Facts and Documents
Price 5 cents

The War and the Working Class of the Capitalist Countries
By GEORGI DIMITROFF
Price 2 cents

Molotov's Report to the Supreme Soviet
By V. M. MOLOTOV
Price 2 cents

Socialism, War, and America
By EARL BROWDER
Price 1 cent

Stop the War
By EARL BROWDER
Price 1 cent

Also:

M. J. OLGIN, LEADER AND TEACHER 1c
Compiled and Edited by the MORNING FREIHEIT Staff

GET ORGANIZED: AN ANTHOLOGY 10c
Stories and poems about trade union people

WORKERS LIBRARY PUBLISHERS
P. O. Box 148, Station D, New York, N. Y.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

REVIEW OF THE MONTH

Sixteen Years Without Lenin. Realizing Stalin's Vow. Crisis of Faith or Crisis of Capitalism? Dewey and Roosevelt. New Deal Deserters Try to Win Communists. Leninism and New Dealism. Honoring Lenin. Nature of Struggle in Finland. Soviet Peace Policies Versus Imperialist Interventions. The People's Government of Finland. What Price Wall Street Morality and Indignation? Temptations and Possibilities. To Keep America Out of War Means Opposing Administration's Imperialist Policies and Interventions. What Do the Masses Feel and Think? Critical and Suspicious of Government's Policies. Experiences and Attitudes of the Masses. Tasks of Leadership. Integration of Economics and Politics Is Key to Present Situation.

IT IS sixteen years this month—January 21—since Lenin died. His passing away on that memorable winter day was received as a tremendous blow by the peoples of the Soviet Union, by the oppressed and exploited all over the world. His death was mourned profoundly, touchingly, tragically as a great and irreparable disaster. It seemed as though the whole world stood still for a while wondering what to do next. Lenin was gone, gone forever. That was on January 21, 1924.

And as the masses stood wondering what next, there came the voice of Stalin—the confident, strong and compelling voice of Lenin's greatest disciple and closest collaborator. It came in the historic vow of Stalin to continue the work of the departed teacher and to bring his plans to fruition. To bring about the victory of socialism in the Soviet Union: to realize the industrialization of the country, the collectivization of agriculture on a high technical basis, the enrichment and further development of socialist democracy, the abolition of classes and class divisions. To build and strengthen the Bolshevik Party.

Speaking for the Bolshevik Party and for the peoples of the Soviet Union, Stalin vowed further: To build up and maintain the armed capacities of the socialist state at such strength as will make it impossible for international capital to attack successfully. To cement the ties of international solidarity between the working class of the socialist state and the workers of the capitalist countries. To render all possible assistance to the liberation movements of all oppressed and exploited by imperialism and capitalism. To build and strengthen the Communist International—the leader of the world struggle against imperialism and capitalism. To defend the purity, integrity and vitality of Marxism-Leninism and to assure the further development of

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the revolutionary theory of the world proletariat. In brief: to fight for the victory of socialism everywhere.

This vow of Stalin sounded like a clarion call to battle and perseverance. And the struggling masses in all countries responded accordingly. Marxists-Leninists knew at once that a dependable leader and worthy successor had taken the place made vacant by Lenin's death. A new chapter had been opened in the world's history.

The sixteen years separating us from that moment have taken us a long way towards the realization of Lenin's ideals and plans. Stalin's vow has been kept, in letter and spirit, and the magnificent results are here for everyone to see. The Soviet Union is already on its way from the first phase of communism —socialism—to its highest phase. It registers growing prosperity for its peoples, steady economic and cultural progress, a continuing development of its political and military mights, and increasing influence in world affairs. In the midst of the second imperialist war, which the imperialists of England, France and the United States seek to transform into a world war, still hoping to turn it against the Soviet Union, the socialist state is laying a firm foundation for peace in Eastern Europe, is helping its neighbors to free themselves of imperialist ties and warmongering interventions, *thus effectively developing in the new situation and by new means its fundamental socialist peace policy.*

Capitalism, on the other hand, passing from a brief period of temporary stabilization into a series of most devastating economic crises, has finally produced a second imperialist war, in which the decaying system and its beneficiaries are getting entangled ever more deeply and irrevocably. The crisis produced by the war, which itself is a result of imperialism and decaying capitalism, is growing deeper every day before our very eyes. And as this crisis of the capitalist system continues to deepen, and to the extent that it does, the working class will face the task, with ever increasing acuteness, of placing on the order of the day the abolition of capitalist slavery.

Thomas E. Dewey, in making his bid for the Republican nomination to the Presidency, could think of no better explanation of the crisis than "defeatism" and lack of "faith." He admitted "that we have a crisis here in America. But ours is a crisis of faith—faith in ourselves, in our system and in our own traditions." All this sounds very mysterious and also a bit mystifying. But it does not tell the whole truth. And the reason it doesn't is because Dewey and his counsellors are afraid of it.

Yes, wide masses of the working class and of other toiling groups in America are losing "faith" in the capitalist system and are becoming opposed to it, and for very good and sound reasons. A system, which in the course of twenty-five years (1914-1939) has produced two devastating imperialist wars and three major economic crises, is rotten-ripe for the scrapheap. A system, which keeps at least a third of the population in perpetual poverty and starvation, finds no employment for ten million able-bodied and willing

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

workers, systematically ruins and degrades agriculture and the farming masses, offers neither present nor future to the youth, and dooms the older people to a life of fear and insecurity, such a system has to go if the people are to live and prosper.

Here is the source of the "crisis of faith" which neither Dewey nor any other capitalist politician dares disclose and examine. Because the source in question would prove to be a crisis of the capitalist system which is decaying and disintegrating. Because such an examination would immediately turn the attention of the masses to the victory of socialism in the Soviet Union, where faith is strong and confidence is growing, where a new and superior social system has proved itself in terms of prosperity, progress and happiness for the masses. Because such an examination would help progress to socialism in the United States, instilling confidence in the American working class that it is able, in alliance with all toilers, to abolish capitalist slavery in this country. It would transform the majority of the American people into "agents of a foreign power," to use the police terminology of our capitalist politicians; and how can this be allowed?

In other words, the American people, led by the working class, would take the teachings of Lenin and Stalin as their guide to liberation from capitalism, as the inspirer of a new faith and confidence, as the only road to true democracy, social security and peace.

It is, in fact, the only road even though certain New Deal ideologists may sincerely believe that they have discovered another and better one. Life itself has shown, and continues to show every day, that this is so.

Faced by the new world situation, by the crisis of capitalism which the war is calling forth, the New Deal Administration is abandoning its own declarations and principles. It drops them one by one, some of them hurriedly and precipitately, as in its turn to active imperialist interventions and warmongering; others more cautiously and circumspectly, as is demonstrated by its maneuvers in the field of domestic policy. In plainer words, *the Roosevelt Administration is systematically purging its New Dealism of all progressive content, substituting for it reactionary content.* This is a fact which can no longer be hidden. Therefore, to continue to look towards the Roosevelt Administration as a force that can help the American people find a progressive way out of the crisis is to commit a disastrous mistake. As long as this Administration felt compelled by force of objective circumstances to advocate certain progressive principles, responding sympathetically to the desires of the masses, even though always more willingly in its declarations than in its deeds, there was good reason for the masses and their organizations to concentrate the main opposition against the Republican Party and to support the Administration in its progressive policies. But the situation now is altogether different. And the masses are beginning to see that both have to be opposed.

What has the New Deal Administration got to offer now that is fundamentally different from Repub-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

lican Party reaction? Nothing at all. The Administration is today competing with its opponents from the Right (Garner Democrats and reactionary Republicans) not by moving closer to the masses of the people but by moving closer to finance capital and the imperialist bourgeoisie; not by becoming more progressive but by becoming less progressive and more reactionary; not by maintaining and extending the New Deal but by abandoning and destroying it. These are also facts—hard facts of reality which cannot be dismissed. These facts the Communist Party has already analyzed. It has shown that in the new world situation created by the war, with the bourgeoisie *as a class* militantly imperialistic, warmongering and reactionary, bourgeois democrats are drawn into the camp of reaction and imperialism. Moreover, bourgeois democrats that happen to be in the Administration of the capitalist state power in this crisis either give way willingly to more militant reactionaries or become such *themselves*. And isn't this happening here before our very eyes?

* * *

THE plain fact staring us in the face is that *the New Deal Administration is abandoning and destroying the New Deal* as the masses of the American people understood it and fought for it. Keeping this major fact of the inner political situation in mind, the question is: what exactly is meant by the recent proposal to win away the Communists and their sympathizers *from* the Communist Party and *for* the New Deal? Such a proposal is evidently in circulation, according to Jay Franklin who often voices opinions prevailing in certain New Deal Administration circles. What does it really mean?

In one of his columns in the *New York Post* (December 6), he tells a story, and an interesting story it is. It transpires that the Soviet "attack" on Finland "leaves the American Communists and their fellow travelers politically and emotionally orphaned." As a result, the popular following of the Communist Party "is draining away like wheat from a slit sack." And—"this presents a golden opportunity to the New Dealers." This golden opportunity is "to win them over to our side." Summing it all up, he concludes:

". . . What is needed is not a psychological concentration camp for all dissenters from our faulty social order but a sign pointing to the nearest exit from Comrade Stalin's American branch organization."

It will certainly be news to the Communists that they have been "orphaned" and that their popular following is "draining away." They will be wondering, we are sure, whether somebody isn't getting ready to label American jails "orphan asylums" to which Communists could be sent for their own good "without" violating the Bill of Rights, as Attorney-General Murphy might say. They will also be wondering whether there isn't a certain division of labor in the Administration, one set of administrators seeking to put Communists in jail because they are "orphans" while another set is trying the same

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

thing—"to win Communists over to the New Deal"—by making them out to be "foreign agents" and by building up so-called "passport cases."

But aside from this: How can the *Administration* win Communists and their supporters to the New Deal, when President Roosevelt and his Government are *abandoning* it, when they are daily destroying its *achievements*, when they are becoming ever more militantly imperialistic and reactionary, when they are *taking over* Dies' policies and Dies' methods? Furthermore: why should *Communists* have to be won over to the New Deal when theirs is *the only political party in the country today* which fights most consistently for the continuation and further development of the progressive policies of the New Deal, which urges the masses to fight as they never did before precisely for the preservation and extention of all those progressive social and political achievements of the working class and its allies that have come to be popularly known as the New Deal? How and why?

It is true, of course, that Communists never have been and never could be simply New Dealers. Communists have a scientific philosophy, theory and program which alone offer a complete and permanent way out of the hell created by decaying capitalism and its ruling class. These are embodied in the teachings of Marx, Engels, Lenin and Stalin. And just because Communists are followers of Lenin and Stalin, they have always been the best and most dependable fighters for those progressive principles which go under the name of the New Deal. Precisely because they are Stalinists, the Communists have proved by deeds their will and ability to help forge the unity of the working class with all toilers in the struggle against capitalist reaction, imperialism and exploitation. They have proved their will and ability *to collaborate* with every force and tendency in the country which is willing to fight for the interests of the masses and against their exploiters. At this very moment, the Communists are straining every effort to help crystallize the widest front of the American people, headed by the working class, against Wall Street imperialism, against the warmongers, against intensified capitalist reaction and exploitation, *against all those forces which are abandoning and destroying the hard-won gains of the masses secured through the struggle in support of the New Deal.*

Therefore, the problem of those who sincerely believed and *continue* to believe in the New Deal (and these are to be found neither in President Roosevelt's Government nor among its apologists) is not to *win* the Communists but *to collaborate with them.* To collaborate with them in building the wide anti-imperialist and anti-monopoly people's front which will fight effectively all imperialists and warmongers, all opponents of what the people conceive to be the New Deal, as well as all those who are now deserting it, abandoning it, and betraying it. And among the latter is the Administration of President Roosevelt.

In commemorating the sixteenth

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

anniversary of Lenin's death, in contemplating the greatness of the Lenin heritage—the Soviet Union, the Communist International, the theory of Marxism-Leninism—in reflecting upon the world-shaking fulfillments of this heritage under Stalin's guidance during the past sixteen years, in envisoning the bright perspectives now opening for the liberation movements of the working class and its allies, in thus honoring Lenin, the masses will derive fresh clarity and confidence to meet successfully the immediate needs of the struggle and, in doing so, proceed to final victory.

* * *

FOUR months of imperialist war have already passed and have visibly sharpened all the basic contradictions of the capitalist world. And the longer the war lasts, the more acute these contradictions become. It is perhaps from this angle that one can best understand the howling orgy of anti-Soviet incitements of the imperialists, especially in the United States, England, France and Italy.

One is reminded of an observation made by Stalin some time ago. He said that whenever the imperialists get into a very tight corner, in their mutual rivalries and conflicts, they are always "tempted" to try a way out at the expense of the Soviet Union. Seeing how the imperialists have seized upon Finland to relieve their "moral" indignation and, while doing so, to set afoot a counter-revolutionary intervention, it is appropriate to inquire whether or not the imperialist bourgeoisie is again succumbing to the old "temptation."

As to the character of the struggle in and around Finland, it is by now perfectly clear what that is. The Finnish White Guards (Mannerheim, Tanner & Co.), traditionally agents of foreign imperialism serving as a counter-revolutionary outpost for anti-Soviet interventions, are apparently trying to do two things. They seek to establish a new "war front" and they try to keep open the Finnish approaches to the Soviet Union (especially to Leningrad), both of which could be used by their imperialist masters when, if and as the situation requires.

On the other hand, the Soviet Union is continuing successfully to realize its socialist peace policy. While Western Europe is being gripped by the imperialist war, in Eastern Europe the foundations are being laid for a lasting and secure peace. This is fundamental in the whole situation. The treaties between Germany and the Soviet Union have not only scotched the provocative plans of the Chamberlains for a German-Soviet war but have also created *conditions* for the development of friendship between the peoples of these two countries. It should be clear to every unprejudiced person that the realization of these conditions spells the establishment of *a major guarantee for peace,* not only in Eastern Europe but in the world at large.

The liberation of the Western Ukrainians and Byelo-Russians following upon the disintegration of the Polish state, and the mutual assistance treaties of the Soviet Union

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

with Esthonia, Latvia and Lithuania (in which the latter received its ancient capital, Vilna), these have marked a further development of Soviet peace policy. It demonstrated, in the first place, that the small neighboring countries were being attracted to the powerful Soviet Union, seeking to become part of the peace bloc which is arising in Eastern Europe. It also demonstrated that a new relationship of forces is being created in the Baltic region, a relationship which eliminates the possibility of the small Baltic states being used by the big imperialist powers for intrigue and counter-revolutionary provocations. And last but not least, an invulnerable wall of defense was being erected against the enemies of peace, not only for the frontiers of the Soviet Union, but also for the *approaches* to these frontiers.

It is certain that the people of Finland, not their betrayers and White Guard oppressors, will be most happy to have their country freed from the intolerable position of a pawn in the hands of the imperialists; that they will be most happy to live in a really independent and free Finland, in close collaboration and friendship with the Soviet Union. These desires and attitudes of the true Finland are fully expressed and represented by the People's Provisional Government which is headed by Otto Kuusinen.

But these desires of the people of Finland could not be realized and Finland could not be freed, without the overthrow of the White Guard government. As long as that gang was gripping the country, Finland was bound to continue a battle field of imperialist intrigue, anti-Soviet interventions and military provocations. With this gang in power, Finland could have neither peace, nor freedom and independence. This has been proved *beyond doubt.*

From this it is evident that a fundamental common interest has come to expression. The Finnish people could not achieve their peace, liberty and independence without overthrowing the rule of the agents of foreign imperialism. Similarly, the Soviet Union, even though it tried to come to an understanding with the former government, couldn't secure the Finnish approaches to its frontiers (to Leningrad), couldn't eliminate imperialist intrigues and provocations in Finland, without meeting force with force, without ordering its Red Army to open military operations, without assisting the Finnish people to liberate themselves and their country from the stranglehold of the White Guard terrorists and war provocateurs. This is the true origin of the people's government in Finland. This is how the defense forces of the Soviet Union came to fight on Finnish soil. This is how the People's Government of Finland and the Government of the Soviet Union have come to conclude a mutual assistance pact.

The victorious course of this struggle is achieving precisely this. It is destroying the plans of the imperialists to extend the war by creating a "new front"—in Finland. It is closing to the imperialists and the war provocateurs the Finnish approaches to the Soviet Union, helping liberate the Finnish people.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

It is extending the peace bloc which is arising in Eastern Europe, strengthening the conditions for peace there and everywhere.

Of course, this alone is enough to account for the "moral" indignation so freely poured out by the bloody imperialists and oppressors. For that matter, anything that "threatens" to limit the field of the imperialist war and (God forbid!) to bring it to an immediate end throws our Wall Street imperialists into a fit, especially a socialist peace policy which helps build a solid peace in such an important and large part of the world as Eastern Europe. The latter would certainly spell "the end of our civilization."

But when the imperialists see that another avenue is being closed, from which "convenient" military attacks against the Soviet Union could be launched, well, then, this is surely the "end." And how can they remain calm in the face of this?

Of course, they should have learned certain things. They should have learned that the Soviet Union is a powerful socialist country; that its defense power is indestructible because it rests on the moral and political unity of its people, on the splendidly equipped Red Army and on a most profound Soviet patriotism; that its importance in international affairs has increased immeasurably and that it has won deep confidence and love among the masses of the people in all countries.

The rulers of Germany undoubtedly took these things into consideration, and also the fact that they couldn't rally the majority of the German people for a war against the great land of socialism, when they made the turn and took the path of peaceful relations with the Soviet Union. This was in August. And what has happened since then, especially the successful unfolding of the Soviet peace policy, has certainly increased (to say the least) the power, defense capacities and influence of the socialist state. Have the imperialists learned something from these developments, or have they not?

Certainly, our "own" imperialists seem to have learned little. It was they and the Washington government who have been and are most vociferous in anti-Soviet incitements and in directly assisting the Finnish White Guard provocations against the socialist country. There was surely more verbal recklessness here than anywhere else, although it does seem as if our imperialists would like their British brethren "to go first" while the latter would prefer the Americans to take the jump. With all that, we are now treated to the spectacle of Finland becoming "an issue" between the Administration and its Republican opponents. Could sheer *gambling* with the peace of America and the welfare of our people be more brazen.

The Republican chiefs want the government to break off relations with the Soviet Union. That is, they say so, although it is quite possible that they are merely "playing" around with it as an issue without really expecting it to happen; and, what is more important, they expect that the mere raising of such a demand by the opposition will

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

strengthen the backing for the anti-Soviet line of President Roosevelt. In this sense, we may be witnessing a division of labor between the Administration and the Republican "opposition." But whichever it is, that much is certain: the situation in the country, which opened up the floodgates (or sewers) of anti-Soviet incitements, giving the Republican chiefs their "chance" to come forward with their break-relations proposal, this situation was created by the imperialist warmongering policies of the American capitalist class, *which policies the Roosevelt Administration is carrying out.*

For the anti-imperialist camp of the people, for labor and its allies, a serious task arises. It is to unite more rapidly their forces *to oppose* the imperialist and warmongering policies and acts of the bourgeoisie and of the Administration. Mere affirmation of opposition to American involvement in the imperialist war is not enough, important and basic as that is. Why? Because, under the flag of neutrality and non-involvement, the American imperialists and the Washington Administration *are actively and imperialistically intervening* in all parts of the world, to prolong and extend the war, to acquire new positions of imperialist power, to amass larger war profits. This is also the meaning of their intervention in Finland. Step by step the Washington Administration is getting this country more deeply and inextricably involved in imperialist rivalries, conflicts and struggles.

Consequently, it does little good to the fight to keep America out of war, if the masses and their organizations confine themselves merely to affirming their desire to keep out of war without clearly expressing the position that *they do not support* the imperialist and warmongering policies and interventions of the Administration. Without opposing these policies and interventions, the fight to keep America out of war has little meaning.

It is therefore necessary to raise more clearly than ever the slogans formulated by the Communist Party and to win the masses for them. Most important of these slogans are: "Do Not Support the Policy of Wall Street and of the Administration Which Is Directed to Continuing and Spreading the Imperialist Slaughter." "Work for the Immediate Cessation of the Imperialist War." "Peace to the Peoples." "Moral Support to the People's Government of Finland." "Fight Against Giving Credits, Munitions and Supplies to the Finnish White Guards.

* * *

WHAT is the true state of mind of the masses of the American people? What have been their experiences during the four months of war? What moods and attitudes are these experiences generating among the workers, the toiling farmers, the exploited middle classes of the cities? It goes without saying that these are crucial questions for the progressive and anti-imperialist leaders of the masses and, in the first place, for the Communists.

First, about the experiences. Despite all the loud peace protestations of the capitalist ruling class

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and its spokesmen, whether in the government or in the "opposition," the masses of the American people display visible signs of uneasiness. And no wonder. Since the beginning of the war between the Anglo-French bloc and Germany, the United States is being steadily involved, more and more, in imperialist rivalries and conflicts in practically all parts of the world. The question that undoubtedly bothers the masses of the people is: where is all this leading to? We are not moving to more peace but to less peace. Why? And how can it be helped?

The lifting of the embargo, championed by the Administration, is proving itself daily to the widest masses as one of the most potent forces for American involvement. It stimulates all the rapacious appetites of Big Business for war profits, creates vested interests in the war, gives a one-sided and distorted direction to the national economy, and emboldens all the imperialistic and warmongering elements in the country.

In the Far East, the Administration is very "active." This too causes uneasiness among wide masses. In the midst of war, the masses cannot help but feel that Washington's preoccupation with the Far East necessarily means imperialist involvement, sharpened rivalries and conflict. And this impression is reinforced by the government's naval and military plans which call for a yearly budget of about three billion dollars. But this does not stand alone. There are new winds blowing from Washington to Latin America. The Good Neighbor policy, always more a promise than a reality, has almost completely disappeared. Progressive Latin Americans are now saying plainly that the Good Neighbor policy is dead. The policy now in operation is plainly one of imperialist conquest of markets, raw materials and strategic positions, a policy carried out not "reciprocally" but "unilaterally." And in doing so, the Administration is once again basing itself on the most reactionary and corrupt elements in the Latin American countries.

One should note in passing that Secretary Hull's policy of "Reciprocal Agreements" exists only nominally as far as Latin America is concerned. The policy as a whole is in a deep crisis due to the war and the general sharpening of all capitalist contradictions. This is at the bottom of the rising fight for the abandonment of the policy. But the most significant thing about this business is that, aside from Secretary Hull, no one in the Administration is seriously defending this policy. And, what is more, the actual policy now pursued in Latin America is not one of free and reciprocal exchange of goods, but one of *imperialist conquest.* From this logically follows the military policy of "defending the hemisphere," with the consequence of mounting expenditures for armaments, and the deepest sort of involvement in the imperialist struggle for world domination which the big European capitalist powers are now carrying on by means of war.

And, lastly, Finland. When one discards, as one should, the sickening hypocrisy of American impe-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

rialism as the "champion of small nations," there stands before the American people in all its ugliness the plain fact of *war-incitement for profit and power*. This is what Big Business seeks by American intervention in Finland. This is the meaning of the "Hoover Relief" and of the shipment of arms and of the granting of credits to the Mannerheim-Tanner White Guards. It is another avenue of American involvement which some flunkeys of Wall Street are already envisoning as an American-led "world crusade" against socialism, communism, and all other liberation movements.

Do the masses of the American people see all these things? Do they understand the ominous import of all these activities of Wall Street and of the Washington Administration?

One thing has already been demonstrated. The overwhelming majority of the people are now determined more than they ever were before not to allow this country to become involved in war. And in this determination, which is of long standing, there is something new, however. *It is a growing and spreading suspicion that the present foreign policies of the Administration are in fact involving this country in imperialist conflicts and war.* This growing suspicion is expressing itself very convincingly, although indirectly, in the following facts:

1. No important organization of workers, toiling farmers and Negroes could be persuaded, in the last month or so, to endorse the Administration's foreign policies; and in the one or two cases where such endorsement was secured, it was under great pressure and with serious reservations.

2. All recent pronouncements by mass organizations of working people have not only signalized the danger of American involvement, demanding that we keep out, but also took note of impending and actual attacks upon the economic standards and political rights of the masses, preparing to resist and combat such attacks.

3. No mass organization of any significance has as yet felt moved by Wall Street's incitements and Washington's "leadership" to offer any kind of approval or support to American imperialist and counter-revolutionary intervention in Finland.

4. Similarly, and despite the nationwide campaign of the entire capitalist press aided by Dies and by the Administration, there is no evidence of any mass approval, let alone support, for the persecution drive against the Communists. On the contrary, there is evidence accumulating of a rising resentment and opposition to these persecutions.

These signs and symptoms are of tremendous significance. They indicate that wide masses of the American people are feeling *uneasy* about the imperialist policies and interventions of the Administration, are beginning to be *suspicious* of them, and are getting ready to *criticize, disapprove* and to *oppose* the imperialist and warmongering policies and activities of the Administration. What the masses need to make this attitude of theirs known to the coun-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

try and to the government is leadership and organization—*initiative and guidance by the anti-imperialist and anti-war forces* in the unions, farm organizations, Negro organizations, middle class organizations and, of course, among the youth and the women.

In brief: the conscious and leading anti-imperialist forces have now the task to bring to effective expression the criticism and opposition of the masses to the imperialist and warmongering policies and actions of Wall Street *and of the Washington Administration.*

Naturally, this cannot be detached from the growing opposition of the masses to the Administration's domestic policies. No. Both must and do go hand in hand. Life itself makes it so. It is the task of good leadership to accelerate the process and make the masses conscious of it.

* * *

WHAT have been the recent experiences of the masses with the Administration's domestic policies?

Take labor. And here the following points are outstanding. The Administration, being very busy promoting Wall Street's imperialist schemes in all parts of the world, has been definitely turning its eyes away from the great problem of unemployment and from the needs of the unemployed. Simply ignoring it, one might say. But this cannot be ignored for long, especially in the face of the fact that, while manufacturing production has risen 22.6 per cent between June and November, factory employment has risen only 7.5 per cent, or about *one-third,* leaving still over ten million workers unemployed. Yet the Administration has nothing to say on that.

Unemployment relief? That too seems to bother the Administration very little. It is busy, you know, helping the Finnish White Guards. But there is the tragedy of Ohio, with plain hunger and starvation among tens of thousands of Americans. And there are going to be many more Ohios. Well, the President utilized the occasion to attack mildly Governor Bricker, the Republican (good politics, the papers say), but did very little himself to relieve the situation, preferring to pass the "unemployables" (a convenient classification) back to the same Governor Bricker.

At the same time, Attorney-General Murphy's Department of Justice, having gotten tired doing nothing to combat the monopolies and trusts, is exercising taking swings at the trade unions. And in two ways: Thurman Arnold "tackles" the A. F. of L. by applying the Sherman Anti-Trust Law to the building trades unions, while Edgar Hoover is threatening the C.I.O. in the mass production industries with his campaign "against sabotage." A very neat scheme, but it is not fooling labor. Labor is beginning to discern a conspiracy against free and independent trade unionism, an effort by the Administration and Big Business to chain the working class to the imperialist and warmongering machine of the capitalist class.

But there is also another avenue through which the governmental

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

departments are attempting "to tackle" labor. It is through persecuting the Communist Party, its members, its leaders. Labor is beginning to see, and progressive working people already see, that the attacks on the Communist Party are attacks against the working class, being part of the one general campaign to hamstring labor and to make it subservient to Big Business and its imperialist war schemes.

Is the Administration treating the toiling farmers any better? Not at all. Chances are that they will suffer worse, if they do not fight jointly with labor, as some of them are already doing. Farm relief and rehabilitation isn't even spoken of nowadays in government circles. It is mostly "national defense" and how to "help" Finland. And as to government payments for quota marketing, there will be no funds for that, said Secretary Wallace, unless some kind of a processing tax is agreed on, *i.e.*, a tax on the mass of consumers which is bound to undermine further the purchasing power of the masses.

When we turn to the experiences of the Negro people, what do we find? Whatever hits the general mass of the toiling people hits them doubly and triply; and they are still waiting for that Anti-Lynching Bill to be taken up and passed by Congress.

And with all that, the winds blowing from the Administration towards the monopolies, Big Business and war profiteers—these winds are turning ever more milder, soothing, friendly, "liberal" and "realistic," while the cost of living is coming up and the purchasing value of the income of the toiling people is shrinking.

These are no longer just analyses and prognostications of the future. These are facts of our everyday lives. These are *experiences* that the masses of the American people have gone through in the last several months, experiences from which they are beginning to draw conclusions *for action*.

The masses have demonstrated in recent weeks that they are not only critical of the Administration's present domestic policies and attitudes but are getting ready to oppose and combat them. The masses have not missed the fact that *with the growing imperialist preoccupations of the Government has come a systematic abandoning and desertion of nearly everything that they supported in the New Deal.* When they hear it reported that President Roosevelt has advised legislative leaders "that he wants Congress to dispose of its routine problems and adjourn not later than next May," they know what it means. It means leaving alone all the burning needs of the masses of the people and sacrificing these needs to Wall Street profits, imperialism and warmongering.

From all of which the leading forces of the working class and anti-imperialist people's front have to draw practical conclusions. The masses are ready to defend themselves against the attacks of capitalist reaction on both the economic and political fields. They are ready to combat all efforts of Big Business and of the Administration to shift the burden of their imperialist adventures and war preparations to

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the shoulders of the toiling masses. They are ready to wage *simultaneously* an economic and political struggle—against imperialism and warmongering, for the protection and improvement of the economic conditions, for the further building up and defense of free and independent trade unionism, for the defense of the democratic rights and liberties of the toiling people and their progressive organizations, against capitalist reaction in all its forms, for the unity of the exploited people against their exploiters.

The key to the promotion of the self-activity and organization of the masses at the present time is the correct *combination and integration* of the economic and political demands of the people. A. B.

ERRATUM

Owing to an incorrect word-order, the following erroneous statement appeared in *The Communist* for December, 1939, p. 1162: "Turkey, supported by Great Britain in its war against Greece, won complete victory in 1921-22." The statement should read: "Turkey, in its war against Greece supported by Great Britain, won complete victory in 1921-22."—*Editor.*

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE UNITED STATES OF EUROPE SLOGAN

BY V. I. LENIN

[Since the outbreak of the war between Anglo-French and German imperialism, the masses have grown increasingly suspicious of the "war aims" of their respective governments. The Chamberlain clique and their Wall Street counterparts fear to commit themselves clearly on the purposes of the war. Instead, under the impact of popular mistrust, they resort to demagogic and deluding slogans, in an attempt to conceal their predatory aims, their campaign to blackout the gains and democratic rights of labor and the people, and their efforts to convert the inter-imperialist conflict into a concerted counter-revolutionary war against the Soviet Union.

We are thus treated to pyrotechnic displays of such slogans as "a new order," "federated Europe," and "United States of Europe." Direct spokesmen and leading apologists for The City and for Wall Street like Lord Lothian, Alfred Duff Cooper, Thomas Lamont and Dorothy Thompson have voiced these catchwords in their addresses and columns. And loud in the chorus are, of course, the voices of the Social-Democratic servitors of imperialism—the Major Atlees and the Louis Waldmans.

It is of prime significance that the spokesmen of imperialism have quite clearly indicated that they have in mind a line-up of "civilized" Western Europe, i.e., *a combination of capitalist Europe, against the U.S.S.R.*

The following article by Lenin—published on August 23, 1915—trenchantly exposes the reactionary nature of the slogan of the "United States of Europe" under capitalism, its imperialist and anti-socialist content. After a quarter of a century, this penetrating analysis remains a keen ideological weapon for defeating the demagogy of imperialism.

The article is notable in that, for the first time, Lenin—proceeding from the law of accelerated uneven development of capitalism in the imperialist epoch—advanced the brilliant teaching of the possibility of the victory of socialism in one country alone. This postulate, further developed by Comrade Stalin, served the Bolshevik Party as a powerful theoretical weapon in smashing the anti-socialist bloc of Trotsky-Zinoviev-Bukharin and in guiding the Soviet workers and peasants to their great socialist achievements.—The Editors.]

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

IN No. 40 of *Sotsial-Demokrat** we reported that the conference** of the sections of our party abroad had decided to postpone the question of the "United States of Europe" slogan pending a discussion in the press on the *economic* side of the question.

At our conference the debate on the question assumed a one-sidedly political character. Perhaps this was partly due to the fact that the Manifesto*** of the Central Committee directly formulated this slogan as a political one ("the immediate *political* slogan," it says), and not only did it advance the slogan for a republican United States of Europe, but it especially emphasized that this slogan is false and senseless "without the revolutionary overthrow of the German, Austrian and Russian monarchies."

To argue against such an approach to the question within the *limits* of a political estimation of the given slogan, for instance, to argue that this slogan obscures or weakens, etc., the slogan of the socialist revolution is absolutely wrong. Political changes of a truly democratic nature, and especially political revolutions, can never, under any circumstances, obscure or weaken the slogan of the socialist revolution. On the contrary, they always bring it nearer, widen the basis for it, draw ever new strata of the petty bourgeoisie and the semi-proletarian masses into the socialist struggle. On the other hand, political revolutions are inevitable in the course of the socialist revolution, which must not be regarded as being a single act, but must be regarded as an epoch of turbulent political and economic upheavals, of the most acute class struggle, civil war, revolutions, and counter-revolutions.

But while the United States of Europe slogan, raised in connection with the revolutionary overthrow of the three most reactionary monarchies of Europe, headed by Russia, is quite invulnerable as a political slogan, the important question of its economic content and meaning still remains. From the point of view of the economic conditions of imperialism, *i.e.*, capital exports and the partition of the world among the "progressive" and "civilized" colonial powers, the United States of Europe is either impossible or reactionary under capitalism.

Capital has become international and monopolistic. The world has been divided among a handful of great powers, *i.e.*, powers successful in the great plunder and oppression of nations. The four Great Powers of Europe, England, France, Russia and Germany, with a population ranging from 250,000,000 to 300,000,000, with an area of about

---

* The central organ of the Russian Social-Democratic Labor Party (Bolsheviks).—*Editors.*

** On March 12-17, 1915, a conference of the sections of the R.S.D.L.P. was held abroad at Berne, Switzerland.—*Editors.*

*** The slogan, "a United States of Europe," occurred in the manifesto on the war issued by the Central Committee of the Bolshevik Party. It was discussed at the Berne Conference at which it was defended by the Bukharin group and included in a resolution submitted by the group but rejected by the conference. As is evident from Lenin's opening lines, the conference decided to postpone resolving this question "pending a discussion in the press on the *economic* side of the question." In writing this article, Lenin carried out the decision of the conference and expressed himself most categorically against the slogan. In studying this article, one should bear in mind that Trotsky began to advocate this slogan before the Berne conference. [Explanatory Note (Condensed) to Lenin's *Selected Works*, Vol. V, p. 338.]

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

7,000,000 square kilometers, possess colonies with a population of almost half a billion (494,500,000), with an area of 64,600,000 square kilometers, *i.e.*, almost half the surface of the globe (133,000,000 square kilometers, not including the Polar region). Add to this the three Asiatic states, China, Turkey and Persia, which are now being torn to pieces by the plunderers who are waging a "war of liberation," namely, Japan, Russia, England and France. In those three Asiatic states, which may be called semi-colonies (in reality they are now nine-tenths colonies), there are 360,000,000 inhabitants and their area is 14,500,000 square kilometers (almost one and one-half times the area of the whole of Europe).

Further, England, France and Germany have invested capital abroad to the amount of no less than seventy billion rubles. The function of securing a "legitimate" profit from this tidy sum, a profit exceeding three billion rubles annually, is performed by the national committees of millionaires called governments, which are equipped with armies and navies and which "place" the sons and brothers of "Mr. Billion" in the colonies and semi-colonies, in the capacity of viceroys, consuls, ambassadors, officials of all kinds, priests and other leeches.

This is how, in the epoch of the highest development of capitalism, the plunder of about a billion of the earth's population by a handful of great powers is organized. No other organization is possible under capitalism. Give up colonies, "spheres of influence," export of capital? To think this is possible means sinking to the level of a little minister who preaches to the rich every Sunday about the greatness of Christianity and advises them to give to the poor, if not several billions, at least several hundred rubles yearly.

A United States of Europe under capitalism is equivalent to an agreement to divide up the colonies. Under capitalism, however, no other basis, no other principle of division is possible except force. A billionaire cannot share the "national income" of a capitalist country with anyone except in proportion to the capital invested (with an extra bonus thrown in so that the largest capital may receive more than its due). Capitalism is private property in the means of production and anarchy of production. To preach a "just" division of income on such a basis is Proudhonism, is stupid philistinism. Division cannot take place except in "proportion to strength." And strength changes in the course of economic development. After 1871 Germany grew strong three or four times faster than England and France; Japan, about ten times faster than Russia. There is, and there can be, no other way of testing the real strength of a capitalist state than that of war. War does not contradict the principles of private property—on the contrary, it is a direct and inevitable development of those principles. Under capitalism the even economic growth of individual enterprises, or individual states, is impossible. Under capitalism, there is nothing else that periodically restores the disturbed equilibrium

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

save crises in industry and wars in politics.

Of course, *temporary* agreements among capitalists and among the powers are possible. In this sense the United States of Europe is possible as an agreement among the *European* capitalists—but what for? Only for the purpose of jointly suppressing socialism in Europe, of jointly protecting colonial booty *against* Japan and America, which feel badly treated by the present division of colonies, and which, for the last half-century, have grown infinitely faster than backward, monarchist Europe, which is beginning to decay with age. In comparison with the United States of America, Europe as a whole implies economic stagnation. On the present economic basis, *i.e.*, under capitalism, the United States of Europe would mean the organization of reaction to retard the more rapid development of America. The times when the cause of democracy and socialism was associated with Europe alone have gone forever.

The United States of the World (not of Europe alone) is a state form of national federation and national freedom which we connect with socialism—until the complete victory of communism brings about the total disappearance of the state, including the democratic state. As a separate slogan, however, the slogan of a United States of the World would hardly be a correct one; first, because it merges with socialism, secondly, because it may be wrongly interpreted to mean that the victory of socialism in a single country is impossible; it may also create misconceptions as to the relations of such a country to the others.

Uneven economic and political development is an absolutely law of capitalism. Hence, the victory of socialism is possible, first in a few or even in one single capitalist country. The victorious proletariat of that country, having expropriated the capitalists and organized its own socialist production, would *confront* the rest of the capitalist world, attract to itself the oppressed classes of other countries, raise revolts among them against the capitalists, and, in the event of necessity, come out even with armed force against the exploiting classes and their states. The political form of society in which the proletariat is victorious, in which it has overthrown the bourgeoisie, will be a democratic republic, which will more and more centralize the forces of the proletariat of the given nation, or nations, in the struggle against the states that have not yet gone over to socialism. The abolition of classes is impossible without the dictatorship of the oppressed class, the proletariat. The free federation of nations in socialism is impossible without a more or less prolonged and stubborn struggle of the socialist republics against the backward states.

It is for these reasons and after repeated debates at the conference of the sections of the R.S.D.L.P. abroad, and after the conference, that the editors of the central organ have come to the conclusion that the United States of Europe slogan is incorrect.

August 23, 1915.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ROOSEVELT, THE WAR, AND THE NEW DEAL

BY GENE DENNIS

I.

IT IS now some ninety days since President Roosevelt urged Congress on September 21 to repeal the arms embargo allegedly in order that the government and the nation should "avoid being drawn into the war." It is also nearly two months since the extraordinary session of Congress adjourned on November 3 after revising the Neutrality Act in accordance with the President's proposal that this move and the foreign policy of the Administration were designed to protect and preserve "American neutrality, American security and American peace."

It is now on the order of the day to compare deeds with words, to survey the character of American "neutrality" as promoted by Roosevelt and to determine in what direction the Government is attempting to lead the country. Moreover, it is necessary to analyze what is happening to the Roosevelt Administration and the progressive features of its former New Deal policies.

To put the matter bluntly: since the outbreak of the imperialist war in Europe, as Comrades Browder, Foster and Bittelman have stressed, and especially since the lifting of the arms embargo, Roosevelt and the Government, acting in behalf of American finance capital, have pursued an increasingly aggressive, reactionary-imperialist policy in foreign and domestic affairs.

This is evidenced in the first place by the activities of the President, the State Department and Congress in the sphere of foreign policy which can be briefly summarized, for the purpose of emphasis, in three chief, closely integrated aims:

1. To prolong, aggravate and extend the imperialist war, by aiding the British-French belligerents. While multiplying its war profits, American capitalism is simultaneously involving the United States deeper in the war economically and politically, thereby facilitating the trend toward America's entry into the war as a military combatant. This was one of the main motivating factors behind the repeal of the arms embargo. This likewise explains the plans of the Administration to circumvent the revised Neutrality Act and extend credits to the Allied powers through granting loans by the Export-Import Bank and the Reconstruction Finance Corp. to "private firms and com-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

panies" in the belligerent countries. Likewise, this is the underlying reason that Roosevelt and the United States Government refused to reciprocate or act favorably upon the recent peace initiatives of the Soviet Union, Germany and the Netherlands to promote an armistice and help terminate the imperialist war. This also explains the bellicose action of the United States in taking unneutral measures against undersea warcraft and in preparing to transfer U.S. shipping to foreign neutral flags so as to ensure expanding war commerce with the Allied imperialists.

2. To strengthen the world domination of American imperialism, especially in Latin America and the Far East. This objective was vividly exposed at the recent Panama Conference, where the United States delegation abandoned all pretense of championing the erstwhile Good Neighbor policy, established an imperialist ring—a so-called neutral zone of three hundred miles—around Latin America, and revived the policy of hard-boiled financial and diplomatic intervention in the life of the Central and Latin American nations. Close on the heels of the Panama meeting came increased pressure of Yankee imperialism on Cuba (the proposed Trade and Navigation Treaty), on Mexico (pressure for return of the expropriated oil lands to the Anglo-American oil trust, intervention of the Dies Committee). Side by side with these measures, the Government went over to an aggressive political offensive in the Far East, developing a more active imperialist policy of diplomatic intervention and pressure. The latest public speeches of Ambassador Grew and the press statement of Assistant Secretary of State Welles lay down the course of action. For in the pronouncements of these U.S. officials, American imperialism has disclosed its immediate objective in the Pacific, *i.e.*, to impede friendly and peaceable relations between the U.S.S.R. and Japan, to weaken China's collaboration with the Soviet Union, and to ensure that the United States has a decisive share and influence in the "new order" which Japanese militarism and the Munichmen are endeavoring to set up in China.

3. To worsen American-Soviet relations, to foster anti-Soviet incitement and war provocations, and to assume a direct and leading role in the organization of a new anti-Soviet front for counter-revolutionary intervention against the Land of Socialism. This has become the central objective around which all plans of American imperialism are being coordinated. It was with this aim in view that the U.S. State Department unfolded the provocative anti-Soviet campaign around the *S.S. City of Flint,* and extended diplomatic "recognition" to the defunct, semi-fascist government of Polish colonels and landlords after it betrayed and deserted the Polish people. For this reason President Roosevelt brazenly intervened in the Soviet-Finnish negotiations in November and together with 10 Downing Street influenced the vassal government of the Finnish bourgeoisie and landlords, headed by Mannerheim, to reject the Soviet peace proposals for

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

establishing a mutual assistance pact, reciprocal measures guaranteeing the security of Leningrad and Finland's independence; and for liquidating the Anglo-French-American imperialist intrigues to convert Finland into a major base of military operations against the U.S.S.R. It was also because of this, as well as in its efforts to influence Japan against concluding a non-aggression pact with the U.S.S.R., that the Roosevelt Government, after helping foster and precipitate the criminal war of the Finnish lackeys of imperialism against the Soviet Union, decided to pursue a more active policy of diplomatic, political, and economic intervention against the Soviet Union. This is why Roosevelt instituted a so-called "moral embargo" against the Soviets and embarked upon Wall Street's policy of openly and directly financing an anti-Soviet imperialist war by granting ten million dollar credits through the Reconstruction Finance Corporation and the Export-Import Bank to the White Guard Finnish Government.

This, in brief, outlines the political orientation and main acts of the Roosevelt Government (as of late December) in the field of foreign policy since the present imperialist war was launched. And what does all this add up to? This shows, as signalized by the Communist Party, that American finance capital and the government headed by Roosevelt are following a reactionary and more aggressive imperialist policy which endangers the cause of democracy and peace, threatening the life, liberties and welfare of the American people.

In order to understand better the present imperialist policy of Roosevelt and the New Deal wing of the Democratic Party, mention should be made of the character of the foreign policy of the Administration in the period preceding the present imperialist war.

ROOSEVELT'S FORMER AND PRESENT FOREIGN POLICIES

Prior to the start of the imperialist war between the rival groups of German and Anglo-French monopoly capital, the Roosevelt Government followed a policy in the sphere of international relations which, in a number of respects and for a short period, coincided, to a certain extent, with the interests of world peace. This is why, in recent years, up to the outbreak of the imperialist war, despite all the vacillations and contradictions of Roosevelt's former policy, it was possible for the Communists and the progressive movement to give qualified support to those aspects of the Administration's "peace policy" and the "peace declarations" of the President which tended even in a limited way to promote American and world peace. Such aspects were, despite their limitations, the progressive features of the Good Neighbor policy, the credits extended to China, the special tariff imposts placed on Germany, the Roosevelt declarations of intention to quarantine the aggressors, etc.

But this "peace policy" of the Government was at all times imperialistic none the less. It was a foreign policy premised upon defense of the status quo (a defense of im-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

perialist interests), upon a temporary and conditional support of peace, upon avoiding immediate goals of armed conquest and a new forcible redivision of the world.

For it must be remembered that, following the World War, despite the sharpened antagonisms between the U.S.A. and Great Britain, the U.S.A. and Japan, etc., and the growing contradictions between world capitalism (including the U.S.A.) and the world of socialism —till now the military power of the U.S.A. and its strategic positions in the Pacific and Latin America did not correspond to its capitalist strength and economic development. Therefore, American imperialism was, until recently, desirous of postponing an armed conflict until it was more fully prepared; it sought to avoid immediate objectives of military conquest; and strove to use the postponement of a new world war as a means of strengthening its own imperialist positions.

This tactical orientation in foreign affairs of course did not deter American monopoly capital, or the Roosevelt Government throughout the whole New Deal period, from steering an imperialist path; from helping strangle Ethiopia, Austria, Spain and Czechoslovakia; from supplying Japanese militarism with over 57 per cent of its war supplies for invading and devastating China; from exerting reactionary pressure on Mexico and Cuba and compelling a number of other Latin American countries to enter into unilateral "reciprocal trade agreements" beneficial to American capital. It did not hinder American imperialism from encouraging and abetting the Chamberlains and Daladiers in their Munich policy of conniving with and fostering imperialist aggression by fascist Germany, Japan and Italy with the object of trying to provoke and precipitate an anti-Soviet war. This, among other reasons, explains why the gap between Roosevelt's former "peace declarations" (for example, his dramatic speech in Chicago in 1937) and the real policy of the Government, before as well as now, always remained at variance and unbridgeable.

But with the profound changes in the international situation brought about by the outbreak of the present imperialist war, American monopoly capital has changed its tactics accordingly, as has the so-called liberal section of the bourgeoisie, typified by Roosevelt and the dominant circles in the New Deal wing of the Democratic Party. This too is why the position of the Communists toward the Roosevelt Government has also changed. Because today, as Comrade Dimitroff has trenchantly said:

"The imperialist war is calling forth a regrouping of the class forces in the capitalist countries. In the camp of the bourgeoisie, the group interests of its different sections are receding before the common class interests of the bourgeoisie. The previously existing division into various opposing groups, into more reactionary and less reactionary elements of the bourgeoisie is yielding place to their common interest in conducting the war and preserving capitalism."*

---

* Georgi Dimitroff, *The War and the Working Class of the Capitalist Countries*, pp. 13-14. Workers Library Publishers, New York.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Therefore, as the bourgeoisie of the United States seeks to aggravate and extend the war in its own imperialist interests, and prepares further to involve the United States in it, the Roosevelt Government is charting a course in the interests of the bourgeoisie, is proceeding upon an aggressive instead of a so-called "passive" imperialist route; is following a reactionary instead of a "progressive" road; is orienting itself to a violent instead of a peaceable solution of world affairs, especially of the questions of foreign markets and spheres of investment and influence. This is why the peaceful relations between the U.S.A. and the U.S.S.R. are being jeopardized by American finance capital and its political statesmen. This is why Anglo-American capital is bending every effort to extricate world capitalism from the deepening and most profound crisis, aggravated by the imperialist war, at the expense of the Soviet Union and the working class and exploited peoples of all lands.

EFFECTIVE USE OF "KEEP AMERICA OUT OF WAR" SLOGAN

Let us now focus attention on one vital aspect of the problem of how to keep America out of the imperialist war and to help bring the war to an end.

The anti-war movement developing on a nationwide scale, largely spontaneous and unorganized, is rallying under the banner of "Keep America Out of War." This is undoubtedly a correct and powerful slogan of mass action. It corresponds to the peace interests and sentiments of the American people, **96.5 per cent** of whom, according to the latest Gallup poll, are opposed to American involvement or entry in the imperialist war. But in addition to the main section of the labor and farm movement, which have taken up this slogan and embodied it in one or another form in their program and resolutions (C.I.O., Farmers Union, Railway unions, the A. F. of L., American Youth Congress, etc.), the Congress of American Industry (National Association of Manufacturers) and bourgeois political leaders of all shades, ranging from Hoover and Hearst to Roosevelt, are demagogically employing this slogan as a decoy to mislead the masses, to mask the reactionary policies of the imperialist bourgeoisie and the government.

If the slogan and movement to "Keep America Out of the Imperialist War," like the slogan "Keep America Neutral," is to become effective, and to help prevent the U.S.A. from being dragged into the present imperialist war or into a counter-revolutionary war against the U.S.S.R., it must be linked up with other slogans and mass actions. It must be connected with mass organization and struggles to resist and combat the policies of our own imperialist bourgeoisie. It must be coordinated with a united working class, popular mass movement directed against each reactionary move and act of the government and the bourgeoisie which are intensifying capitalist exploitation and reaction, and are day by day actually involving the United States more deeply in the imperialist war.

Therefore more consideration

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

should be given to expose concretely the imperialist character of the war and the war plans and activities of American imperialism, particularly as they are unfolded by the New Deal Administration. This requires explaining more widely and effectively why capitalism breeds war, exploitation and reaction, and why socialism—triumphant in the Soviet Union—brings peace, liberty, national and social emancipation to the working class and oppressed people in every country. This means to influence and help direct the growing anti-war mass movement away from pacifist influences, into channels of broad mass actions to help bring the war to an end, thereby best keeping America out of it; to prohibit war credits and other aid to the imperialist belligerents in Europe, to Japan, to the imperialist pawn, Finland, and to "neutral" powers like Sweden and Italy, which are participating in anti-Soviet provocations and war actions; to oppose the armaments program and other war preparations of the Administration; to maintain and extend progressive labor and social legislation and protect civil liberties and trade union rights. A more consistent and energetic struggle must be waged to expose, isolate and defeat the agents of the bourgeoisie and warmongers within the ranks of the labor movement, *i.e.*, the Greens, Wolls, and Freys, the Norman Thomases and Waldmans, and especially the counter-revolutionary Trotskyite and Lovestoneite lackeys of imperialism. Finally, and above all, it is necessary more vigorously and effectively to explain and popularize the peace policy of the Soviet Union and really to develop mass support for its policies. In the interests of socialism and proletarian internationalism, these policies are directed in the immediate situation towards protecting and strengthening the security of the socialist state and blocking and frustrating all imperialist intrigues and attempts to create a new anti-Soviet front for military intervention against the U.S.S.R.; towards ending the imperialist war in the interests of the working people, towards establishing a people's peace, towards protecting the national independence and freedom of the people, simultaneously bending every effort to restrict the spread of the war and to take all measures for alleviating the suffering and devastation rained on the people of all lands by the imperialist warmakers.

II.

ROOSEVELT'S SWING TO THE RIGHT IN DOMESTIC AFFAIRS

Closely interwoven with the reactionary foreign policy of the Roosevelt Administration in the new international situation is a corresponding swing to the Right in internal affairs by the President and the dominant New Deal circles. The two are inseparably connected and arise from and are based upon the war plans and aggressive imperialist designs of Wall Street.

What are some of the symptoms and trends indicating this anti-labor, undemocratic and warmongering orientation of the Government as reflected in its domestic policy?

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The imperialist war was but a few days old when the President proclaimed a state of "limited national emergency." Aside from its use as a medium for fostering war hysteria and for speeding up United States military preparations on an unprecedented scale, this action, from its inception, has proved to be a move directed against the "enemy within" the country, against the labor movement, and in the first place against the Communist Party which is in the forefront of the struggle to establish working class unity and a people's front movement to keep America out of the imperialist war and to bring this predatory war to an end.

This is why it was only a short step from the manufacture of a state of "limited national emergency" to the many-sided attack against the civil liberties and constitutional rights of the Communist Party launched by the Department of Justice, in conjunction with the State Department, the Department of Labor, the infamous Dies Committee, the Republican National Committee and the warmongering press, with Mrs. Roosevelt and the other pre-war "liberals" chiming in for good measure. The "passport" indictments, the projected indictment for "income tax violations" and "failure to register as foreign agents," etc., are the "legal and constitutional" instrumentalities utilized in the attempt to illegalize the Communist Party and imprison our National Committee and its staunch Bolshevik leader, Comrade Browder. They are creatures of Roosevelt's "national emergency" preparations. These "technical" means for persecuting the Communist Party have been brought into play to enable the Government to try more easily to disorganize and shackle the labor and anti-war movement and to try to chain the people to the war chariot of American imperialism.

And while the technique may differ, the current onslaughts against the Communist Party, instigated by the big monopolists through the Roosevelt Administration, have the same objective as the anti-Communist and anti-Soviet policy inaugurated by Daladier, Blum and the French bourgeoisie. The suppression of *l'Humanité* and subsequently of the Communist Party was the prelude to plunging France into the imperialist war and establishing a more openly reactionary dictatorship of finance capital, *i.e.*, government by decree, the abrogation of parliamentary and municipal elections, the regimentation and military control of the trade unions and popular mass organizations, the wiping out of the 40-hour week and the other social gains achieved by the French working people under the leadership of the Communists and the united people's front movements initiated by them. As in France, so today in the United States the drive against the Communist Party, now in its first stages, is being paralleled with increased repressive measures against the labor and democratic mass movements.

Besides the offensive under way drastically to curb federal and state expenditures for the unemployed, for farm aid and other social needs (with which we shall deal presently), the following attacks, front-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

al and indirect, against the labor movement must be noted:

1. The new "anti-trust" drive against the trade unions launched by Attorney-General Murphy and the Department of Justice, which is synchronized with vicious attacks against the N.L.R.B., the Wagner Act, and the Wages-Hours law. This move, aimed at both the A. F. of L. and C.I.O., will not only be used to lower wages and weaken labor organization in the building trades industry, but, if not combatted and defeated, will most probably be employed by the government, pending the introduction of the M-Day and mobilization plans, to "outlaw" sit-down and slow-down strikes, to suppress national, interstate and solidarity strikes, as well as other forms of labor activities on the economic and political front.

2. The President's recent pronouncement to the effect that W.P.A. workers "cannot strike against the Government" or participate in other "disturbances." In other words, the President, elaborating upon the anti-strike policy laid down by Murphy and Harrington in the actions of the W.P.A. workers who resisted the Woodrum starvation act last year, has publicly announced that the Administration intends to prohibit W.P.A. workers from exercising their inalienable democratic right of freedom to strike, demonstrate and petition. If this dictatorial policy is not firmly resisted by labor, it will undoubtedly be extended similarly to curb the democratic rights of all persons covered by the Social Security Act, the federal farm program, etc.

3. The "special counter-espionage activity" being developed by the F.B.I. in collaboration with the labor espionage apparatus of the big industrialists. This activity, which has already met with the vigorous protests of the Cleveland C.I.O., presages a new drive against the C.I.O. and collective bargaining in the basic industries, *i.e.*, the war industries. It is being organized precisely at the moment when the progressive labor unions are preparing to extend the campaign to organize the unorganized and by means of mass organization and a militant policy really to curb war profiteering and the powers of monopoly capital.

4. The preliminary measures being taken in Washington by the Administration and the Army and Navy Departments for enacting, step by step, the anti-labor provisions of the M-Day plans which provide for the regimentation and virtual military control of organized labor. Commenting upon the Industrial Mobilization Plan and current Administrative activity to lay the groundwork for its application, Congressional Intelligence, Inc., in its weekly digest of September 23, 1939, called attention to the fact that in the event of American involvement in the war:

". . . controls over labor in the field of the draft for both war and work, wages, hours, working conditions and the suspension of all labor laws now on the books would be immediately put forward by the defense agencies of the Government, and Congress would be asked to act on these recommendations. They are already blue-printed and men already are under consideration to head up the contemplated Labor Administration."

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

But since this was written, the Government has moved a long way toward preparing for the introduction of the M-Day plan and will sponsor a series of legislative measures in the coming session of Congress to expedite this phase of its war plans.

THE ADMINISTRATION'S "ECONOMY" PROGRAM

Equally indicative of the path toward reaction and war which leading New Deal circles are travelling is the Administration's new "economy" program, itself a vital part of the war plans of American finance capital. The main features of this project, already unofficially confirmed by White House spokesmen, are a series of measures for expanding "national defense" expenditures, severely curtailing federal appropriations for social welfare, as well as proposals for increased governmental aid for placing the economy of the country on a war-time basis.

The President has indicated that he will request Congress in January to raise the budget for army and naval expenditures to about three billions for the fiscal year of 1940. This unprecedented "peace-time" military expansion program entails the virtual establishment of a "two-ocean" navy and the creation of new mechanized army corps and aviation units capable of large-scale offensive operations abroad. Clearly, this gigantic military program is designed neither for "national defense" nor for preserving American peace. It is unquestionably being undertaken in conjunction with the strengthening of the National Guard, the R.O.-T.C. and the militarization of the C.C.C., so as to place the armed forces of the country on a war footing, in accordance with the war plans of the imperialist bourgeoisie.

But where does the "economy" come in? How does the Administration plan to increase the expenditures for "national defense" from one to one and a half billions as compared to 1939, as well as restrict the budget deficit in the coming fiscal year to about two billion dollars, as proposed by Roosevelt and Senator Harrison, a decrease of over one and a half billions as compared with the budget deficit for 1939?

The *Congressional Intelligence* bulletin of December 2 admits that the ". . . Administration hopes to cut normal budgets deeply. . . ." What is contemplated is partially revealed by C. B. Dickson in the *Washington Post* of November 21. Mr. Dickson writes:

"Sharp slashes in spending appropriations also are to be proposed by President Roosevelt. Decision has been made against asking for any new P.W.A. appropriation and it was considered likely that $1,100,-000,000 would be asked for W.P.A., a reduction of $325,000,000 under the current outlay."

And this with nearly 11,000,-000 unemployed and with only 1,930,463 persons on W.P.A. in the week ending November 8, 1939, as compared with 3,262,667 on the W.P.A. rolls this time last year!

Corroborating this estimate of the character of the "economy" program advanced by the Roosevelt Government are such developments as the

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

following: Colonel Harrington's announcement that W.P.A. will not request a deficiency appropriation for the current year; Secretary Wallace's recent address to the Federal Farm Bureau where he stated in effect that there would be no large grants for farm subsidies and relief next year unless additional taxes were levied, probably some form of a processing tax; the unofficial reports from the White House that the Wagner Health Bill will not be enacted this year and that the Federal housing program will not be expanded above its present low level, and possibly may be curtailed; the jubilant statements of leading spokesmen from the national committees of both the Democratic and Republican Parties hailing the defeat of the "Ham and Eggs" and Bigelow old age pension plans and warning against any "radical innovations and changes" in the Social Security Act, etc.

These "signs of the times" symbolize the new political orientation of the Administration which is rapidly abandoning the avowed social objectives and legislative program of the New Deal. They indicate that the leading New Deal Democrats are adopting the Hoover Republican "economy" slogans as their own and are beginning to put them into operation. But more than this, the new "economy" program of the Roosevelt Government—a fitting counterpart of the "economy" program of the Republican State administrations in Ohio, Pennsylvania, Michigan and elsewhere—represents the determination of the Federal Administration and the economic royalists to shift the burden of the mounting imperialist war preparations onto the shoulders of the workers, the toiling farmers, the youth, the Negro people and small businessmen. It signalizes, further, the spread and intensification of capitalist exploitation and reaction which are facilitated and promoted by the Roosevelt Adminstration.

GEARING THE NATIONAL ECONOMY FOR WAR

Organically connected with the national defense and "economy" plans of the Government and the monopolies are the efforts of the Roosevelt Administration to accelerate the transformation of the national economy of the country into a war economy.

The huge and growing expansion of the armed forces of the nation and consequently of the war industries, coupled with the proposed wholesale retrenchment and curbing of federal social expenditures for socially beneficial public works —hospitals, schools, federal housing, farm rehabilitation and government employment for youth—is already diverting vast sections of public and private enterprises into channels devoted primarily to imperialist war preparations.

In line with this the War Resources Board has put the finishing touches upon the M-Day plans worked out by the Army and Navy Departments in 1936. Concerning the scope of the Industrial Mobilization Plan, popularly known as the M-Day plan (to which we have already referred), Congressional Intelligence, Inc., says:

"Subject only to a final check-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

over and approval by the War Resources Board and high War and Navy chiefs is the latest revision of the general plan which defense agencies are recommending for control of the nation's economy in a war-time emergency.

"The plan provides centralized control over resources, productive machinery, capital, man-power, production, prices and public information.

"Supreme over the entire set-up would be a War Resources Administration, headed up by one Adminstrator."

It is evident who would control and operate the War Resources Administration—the big monopolists and imperialist war-makers. This was made amply clear by Roosevelt appointments to the War Resources Board. Five of the seven board members belong to billion-dollar corporations: Mr. Stettinius of U.S. Steel and the House of Morgan; Mr. Pratt of General Motors; General Wood of Sears Roebuck & Co.; Walter S. Gifford, president of the American Telephone and Telegraph Co.; and John C. Hancock, Chicago banker who led last year's abortive fight of the New York Stock Exchange to scuttle the S.E.C. The other two are intellectual fronts for Wall Street. They are Karl T. Compton, president of Massachusetts Institute of Technology, and Harold G. Moulton, who has converted the Brookings Institution into the Republican Party's unofficial research agency.

Obviously the net effect of the "national defense" and "economy" plans of the Roosevelt Government, of the M-Day plans and other measures for converting the economy and industrial life of the nation into a war economy, into a nationwide system geared for imperialist war, will be to bring disaster and greater impoverishment and suffering upon the people unless stubbornly opposed and combatted by labor and the working masses. For this will not only further facilitate America's involvement in the war, but also will further consolidate the power of monopoly capitalism at the expense of the masses. It will lead to even greater concentration and centralization of finance capitalism. It will help create a "war prosperity" for the big monopolists; and, while increasing employment on a limited scale in the war industries, will leave unsolved the fate of the ten million unemployed, meanwhile bringing greater exploitation and oppression of employed and unemployed alike.

"NATIONAL UNITY" WITH BIG BUSINESS

Symbolic of the direction of the Roosevelt Government is the developing rapprochement between the so-called New Deal and the Garner-Glass wings of the Democratic Party. While it is true that there remain shades of differences between these groups, chiefly on secondary issues of policy as well as around the traditional inner-party maneuvers over candidates and patronage, the former cleavage in the Democratic Party ranks is fast being healed.

In his first "fireside chat" immediately after the outbreak of the present war, and again in his message to Congress on September 21, the President, in the name of "na-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tional unity," offered an "outstretched hand" to both the anti-New Deal Democrats and the equally reactionary Republicans. It must be admitted that the President's efforts to help restore party harmony and to establish a measure of "national unity" among the Democratic chieftains and important sections of the Republican Party around the war plans of the Administration have been met with considerable success, particularly on the question of foreign policy.

This was evidenced by the vote on the repeal of the arms embargo and by the united Democratic and influential Republican support given the Administration by outstanding leaders of the two parties subsequently in each phase of the government's bellicose and imperialistic diplomatic and political intervention and activities in Finland, Latin America and the Far East. Where the Republican leaders have taken issue with the Administration in recent months on matters of foreign policy, these differences have been confined chiefly to tactical questions and not to the basic principles and policies involved. Thus, for instance, the "differences" recently expressed by Hoover and Vandenberg with Roosevelt over immediate severance of diplomatic relations with the U.S.S.R. resolved themselves essentially into inter-party competition as to which of the two major capitalist parties should lead the anti-Soviet crusade.

As for the changing relations between the anti- and pro-New Deal Democrats, among the straws in the wind betokening the "burial of the hatchet" are the following: the agreement between the President and Harrison-Glass-Hanes, *et al.* regarding the proposed "economy" program and postponement of tax revision at the coming session of Congress *; the appointment of four Morgan men out of seven Board members to the War Resources Board; the recent appointment of three Wall Street bankers as an advisory committee to the U. S. Treasury Department; the formation of an agricultural advisory council by Secretary Wallace composed chiefly of representatives from the food, packing, processing, and distributive trusts and associations; Ambassador Kennedy's endorsement of a third term for Roosevelt (with Chamberlain's blessing); Senator Pepper's speech in South Carolina in November advocating the selection of U. S. Senator James Byrnes of the Southern Bourbon hierarchy as the 1940 Democratic vice-presidential nominee; the elevation of Jesse Jones and Paul V. McNutt virtually to the rank of Cabinet members; the close collaboration between the Administration and the Dies Committee, notwithstanding the recurrent shadow-boxing of the President and Mrs. Roosevelt over the "procedure" of this un-American inquisition; the appointment of Colonel Fleming to the Wages and Hours Administration and of Wm. Leiserson to the N.L.R.B.

These trends in the policies and activities of the Roosevelt Govern-

* Concerning the latter, Congressional Intelligence comments on December 2: ". . . at one time Secretary Morgenthau was prepared to offer minor tax changes. But, when advised that any tax bill would open a loophole for war-profit tax advocates to push through a thumping war profits levy, he agreed that tax matters could be deferred a year."

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ment and its orientation toward an increasingly aggressive imperialist policy in foreign and domestic affairs made it necessary for our Political Committee to state in its October 13 resolution:

"In view of the political changes and realignments taking place within the country, bourgeois democrats are gravitating towards and being drawn into the imperialist camp, and not only the old division between the Republican and Democratic Parties but also that between the New Deal and anti-New Deal camps, is losing its former significance. Both are parties of the bourgeoisie and seek in various ways to realize and promote the predatory interests of American imperialism in the war and both are following policies which threaten to involve the U.S.A. in the present war. *The working class cannot support these policies.*" *

Now only the blind can fail to see the full validity and timeliness of our Party's estimate.

Naturally, Roosevelt and the upper New Deal circles endeavor to carry out their pro-war imperialistic policy by various maneuvers, such as the policy of "national unity." As early as September 21 the President appealed to the Garner Democrats and the Hoover Republicans: "These perilous days demand cooperation between us without a trace of partisanship." But as events have shown, behind the slogan of national unity, all sections of the American bourgeoisie are uniting to drag America onto the path of imperialist aggrandizement and war and to be in a better position to wage the class war of the exploiters against the working people and their organizations. Under the slogan of national unity, Big Business, through the Government, is also making special efforts to achieve "labor peace," particularly to effect trade union "unity" on the basis of the class collaboration program of the Wolls, Freys, Greens and Dubinskys (and with not a little support from Sidney Hillman).

Draping themselves in the flag of "national unity," "neutrality," and "national defense," American monopoly capital is again endeavoring to re-establish the "sacred union" of the economic royalists, the "liberal" bourgeoisie, and the top officialdom of the trade union movement around the Roosevelt Government such as existed in the first period of the Roosevelt Administration from 1932 to 1935.

It should be remembered that during the first term of the Roosevelt Government, the big monopolists, with Roosevelt and the "liberal" bourgeoisie whom he represented, used the slogan of "national unity" as a medium of helping to extricate American capitalism from the lowest depths of the acute economic crisis of 1929-33. This was achieved, to be sure, primarily at the expense of the most exploited sections of the working class, the farmers and the city middle classes, notwithstanding the limited, though important, social reforms introduced by the Government in response to the demands and pressure of the rising labor and democratic mass movement. Later, when the "honeymoon" of the "national unity" period of 1932-35 was over, the most

* "America and the International Situation," in *The Communist*, November, 1939, p. 995.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

aggressive sections of American monoply capital steered a pro-fascist course. Roosevelt and the "liberal" bourgeoisie, frightened by the menace of fascism and faced with a strengthened and more politically conscious labor and democratic front movement, vacillated between a policy of progressive bourgeois-democratic reforms and that of complete capitulation to the reactionary economic royalists. The decisive sections of monopoly capital withdrew their support from the Roosevelt Government and actively opposed it, while Roosevelt and the New Deal Democrats were compelled to rely more heavily upon the labor and progressive movement and to make a number of concessions to it, thereby making possible labor's qualified support.

But today, following the outbreak of the war for which the bourgeoisie of all countries are responsible, when world capitalism finds itself in its deepest crisis, the American bourgeoisie as a class is coming forward not only with attempts to strengthen its imperialist positions but also to endeavor to "save" world capitalism.

In this situation Roosevelt and the New Deal Democrats are capitalizing on their former prestige as "liberals" and are temporarily enjoying a certain mass influence. The Roosevelt Government is due to retain administrative power at least until January, 1941; the economic royalists are therefore trying with success to utilize the Administration as one of the main vehicles and class instruments for carrying out the imperialist policy and war plans. This is why important sections of finance capital are again collaborating with the Roosevelt Government, influencing its policies and striving to weld "national unity" around Roosevelt and the Government. At the same time Roosevelt and the majority of the bourgeois-democrats who constitute the leading section of the New Deal wing of the Democratic Party, are acting as the "liberal" bourgeoisie acts in all profound crises: they vacillate and then inevitably align themselves with the most reactionary and dominant circles of the bourgeoisie, making the cause of the big monopolists their own.

It is clear that the "national unity" sponsored by Roosevelt and the capitalist class, if not resolutely combatted, can have only the gravest consequences for the American working class and the common people. For it is the "national unity" of a desperate and aggressive imperialist bourgeoisie that aims to lead our country into imperialist adventures and war which can only bring devastation and misery for the working people. It is the "national unity" of the bourgeoisie as a class moving to establish an openly reactionary government and the dictatorship of the most imperialistic and chauvinistic sections of finance capital. They are attempting for this purpose to use the Roosevelt Government as a "transmission belt" and "front." Nor is it excluded that the reactionary imperialist government which moponoly capitalism aims to establish may be achieved, not only with the assistance of the Roosevelt Administration, but by and with it.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

III.

FOR LABOR'S INDEPENDENT POLITICAL ROLE IN 1940

In view of the predatory war and the political orientation of Roosevelt and the New Deal Administration, what new tasks confront the American working class and its allies in the 1940 elections?

It is now clear as a result of the political changes in the country on the basis of the new international situation that in order to resist and defeat the policy of the American imperialist bourgeoisie the working class can no longer orient itself, as in 1936 and 1938, to a policy which includes as one of its tactics support for a third term for Roosevelt and an electoral alliance with the New Deal wing of the Democratic Party. As the resolution of the Political Committee of October 13 declares, the division between the New Deal and anti-New Deal sections of the Democratic Party has lost its former significance; the Roosevelt Government, especially since the outbreak of the present war, continues to unfold an imperialist policy in both foreign and domestic affairs, similar in essence, though not in form, to the reactionary policy of the Republican Party.

The Democratic and Republican Parties remain bourgeois parties, representing the interests of finance capital. Both parties are advancing the interests of the imperialist bourgeoisie and its war plans. While in 1940 the Democratic and Republican Parties may adopt different tactical positions and planks on secondary questions, both parties will compete for control of federal and state government administrative powers in traditional bi-partisan style, characteristic of previous election struggles between the two major capitalist parties. The Democratic Party will undoubtedly come forward as the defender of "American neutrality" and for "aid to the democracies by measures short of war," as well as lay claim to being the party of "New Deal social reforms." The Republican Party, on the other hand, may pose as the "peace party" (though this is by no means certain, as the big monopolists wish to avoid if possible any sharp struggle in the election campaign over the issue of foreign policy), and as the champion of "a balanced budget" and "jobs and recovery through private industry."

Clearly, the working class and its allies, who must judge deeds and not merely words, cannot support or rely upon either the Democratic or Republican Parties. For, as we have shown, neither the Democratic Party, including the high New Deal circles, nor the rock-ribbed reactionary Republican Party, can or will keep America out of the imperialist war. Both parties, despite partisan differences, pursue a policy in the interests of Big Business of prolonging and spreading the war, of facilitating monopoly war profits, of strengthening the position of American imperialism on a world scale, of fostering anti-Soviet relations—all of which inevitably lead to involving America deeper in the imperialist war. And while the Republican Party favors immediate action to scuttle civil liberties and major labor and social legislation, the Democratic Party likewise rap-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

idly moves in this direction by subverting the Bill of Rights in a "constitutional" manner, by abandoning social reforms and sacrificing social security to the aims of imperialist war preparations.

Therefore the chief task confronting the labor movement in the 1940 elections will be to forge working class unity and a united people's front from below against the imperialist war, reaction and capitalist exploitation; a people's front of struggle, under working class leadership, directed against the chief enemies of the working people—the Wall Street monopolists and their political representatives; a united people's front movement which cannot include or support the Roosevelt Government and the dominant sections of the former New Deal wing of the Democratic Party, but in fact must struggle against the war-making, anti-labor policies of the Administration and the high New Deal circles.

This is why the most advanced sections of the working class, now more than ever before, are striving to develop to the maximum labor's independent political initiative, leadership and influence. They are working to establish labor's leading role in rallying and uniting the anti-war, anti-imperialist, anti-monopoly camp. This is why today, under the new conditions, the most class-conscious labor leaders are orienting themselves toward a policy of independent political action in alliance with the toiling farmers, the city middle classes, and the Negro people. This is why the idea being advanced in progressive labor circles of establishing a new political instrument for labor and the common people is gaining ground. For certainly a burning need of the hour is the creation of a broad, united people's front movement and party, an anti-imperialist party of peace which could be depended upon to keep America out of the imperialist war; which would exercise the full strength of the United States to help bring this predatory war to an end; which would see to it that the economy of the country serves the interests of the people and is not converted into a war economy to serve the needs of the Allied belligerents and the war preparations of "our own" imperialists; which would stubornly defend and extend the Bill of Rights and every trade union and civil liberty of labor and the working people; which would genuinely struggle to realize the social objectives of the New Deal as understood and fought for by labor and the people, that is, would fight against war profiteering and for the curbing of the economic and political powers of the monopolists, and on this basis really promote jobs, security, democracy and peace.

In line with the growing trend and activity within the progressive labor movement to promote labor's independent political action, the working class should bend every effort to organize the unorganized, to protect and improve its working standards, trade union and democratic rights, including the civil rights of the Communists. It should simultaneously collaborate with and help strengthen the mass organizations and movements of the exploited farmers, the democratic

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

youth and women, the Negro people and of the progressive national and fraternal groups. It should develop and extend every manifestation and medium of joint and parallel unity of action on the economic and political field between the C.I.O. and the A. F. of L. and Railroad Brotherhood memberships on the basis of a militant struggle for labor's needs and class interests. It should devote special attention to strengthening existing labor and farmer-labor political organizations, working to combat and isolate all warmongering and pro-imperialist elements within them, helping to develop maximum inner democracy within these organizations, to broaden their base and mass legislative and independent electoral activities, and to bring forward a more rounded program of action, an anti-war, anti-imperialist, anti-monopoly capitalist program. Similarly, while crystallizing and developing its independent political activities along the lines of forging a new political instrument, labor should, in preparation for 1940, likewise concentrate now in the states and localities upon organizing a wide people's front mass movement and upon laying the basis for the election of labor's own representatives to Congress and the state legislatures.

At the same time, while organizing for 1940 and following a working class policy, an independent political role, labor should strengthen, not weaken, its ties and collaboration with all sincere anti-war elements in the progressive movement, including certain individuals and sections in and around the former New Deal camp who will struggle, in alliance with labor and under its leadership, against the imperialist war, against capitalist reaction and for the defense of trade union and civil rights for labor, including the Communists. This, despite the fact that the working class should not support either the Democratic or Republican Parties and their imperialist policies. As the October 13 resolution of the Political Committee notes:

". . . among the so-called progressive sections in and around both parties, especially the Democratic Party, there are elements who, because they reflect, even though distortedly, certain anti-war and anti-monopoly attitudes of farmers and middle classes, may offer to labor certain possibilities for effecting even temporary political understandings with such individuals and groups."

WHAT LABOR MUST DEMAND OF CONGRESS

On the road to 1940, the preparations for and the outcome of the struggle around the next session of Congress will assume great importance. The tory coalition of reactionary Republicans and Democrats which operated in the first session of the 76th Congress will be able to function in a new way, under the flag of "national unity," in alliance with the majority of the so-called New Dealers. Emboldened and aided by the collaboration and imperialist policy of the Roosevelt Administration, they will proceed to launch sharper attacks upon the labor and democratic movements and the living standards of the people. Only the utmost vigilance, organization,

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

unity and mass action of the working class, together with its allies, can defeat this reactionary onslaught.

Therefore it is essential that labor, in collaboration with its allies, especially the toiling farmers, should organize and register its political influence and with united forces place its demands upon Congress; mobilize its unions and other mass organizations; develop united actions, such as local, state and national labor and people's legislative conferences and meetings. In the forefront of the program of immediate demands around which labor and the working people should rally and unite their forces and bring maximum pressure upon Congress, the state legislatures, and municipal councils, should be issues and demands, many of which have been initiated and brought forward in the legislative programs of the C.I.O., the A. F. of L. Central Labor Bodies, the Workers Alliance, the Farmers Union, the American Youth Congress, etc., such as the following:

(a) First of all, a series of proposals to keep America out of the imperialist war; opposition to all war credits to belligerents; opposition to the militarization program and all imperialist war preparations and armaments; opposition to any diplomatic and other action by the President, the State Department, or Congress which would tend to continue the war, aid one or the other warring imperialist groups or worsen American-Soviet relations; enactment of measures drastically to curb war profiteering and monopoly profits and control.

(b) Secondly, it is necessary vigorously to oppose the establishment of a war economy at the expense of the people and to oppose imperialist war expenditures and prevent these from supplanting vital appropriations for social welfare. It is imperative to press for the enactment of legislation to inaugurate an annual housing program providing for the building of at least one million homes annually; to establish an old-age pension system providing $60 monthly for all over 60; to enact the Wagner Health Bill; to expand W.P.A. to provide a minimum of three million jobs on socially beneficial projects at union wage standards; to broaden and improve N.Y.A. and C.C.C. under civilian control; to launch an adequate nationwide program for farm tenant rehabilitation and drought relief, debt moratorium, as well as a large-scale program of credit facilities and long-term, low-interest loans to the toiling farmers and small businessmen; to press for the adoption of a people's tax program with a heavy excess profits tax and a steeply graduated tax on incomes in the higher brackets and on corporate surpluses of over $25,000 a year, as well as to abolish tax-exempt securities.

(c) Thirdly, it is essential that the drive of the war-makers designed to nullify the Bill of Rights and all democratic liberties be defeated; that all the so-called anti-alien and sedition bills be rejected; that the anti-lynching and anti-poll tax bills be passed; that the La-Follette-Thomas Oppressive Labor Practices Bill and the Walsh-Healy amendments be adopted and that

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the LaFollette Civil Liberties Committee be continued; that the Wagner Labor Relations Act and the Fair Labor Standards Act be not emasculated; that the un-American Dies and Smith Committees be discontinued and repudiated; that the civil rights and freedom of action of labor, including the Communists and all other anti-war anti-imperialist organizations, be protected and preserved inviolate.

By organizing and rallying the masses around such demands as these, labor will be able more effectively to check and defeat reaction's offensive within and outside of Congress. It will be able to deal heavy blows at the imperialist war-makers. It will strengthen its independent political influence and leadership in the affairs of the nation, advancing the struggle for social security, democracy and peace and its fundamental class interets.

* * *

Towards the solution of the new tasks confronting the labor movement as a result of the imperialist war and the changed political alignments, we Communists, now as always, are mobilizing our maximum strength and political influence. We are exerting every effort to help organize and unify the working class and to forge a united people's front of struggle against the imperialist war and the policies of the American bourgeoisie, for ending this predatory war and thereby best keeping America out of it, for safeguarding the national and social security of the American working people, for advancing the cause of socialism.

Steering a firm and steadfast course, guided by the compass of Marxism-Leninism, inspired by the heroic and masterful example of Stalin and the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, we Communists are marching forward, equipping ourselves and our class to solve the new responsibilities which history has placed before the American working class and our Party. And in preparation more effectively to fulfil these historic tasks and responsibilities with Bolshevik devotion and dispatch, in the spirit of proletarian internationalism, we American Communists are especially mindful of the counsel of Comrade Dimitroff set forth in his brilliant pamphlet, *The War and the Working Class of the Capitalist Countries:*

"In these changed conditions *the tasks facing the working class also assume a new character. Whereas formerly the task was to concentrate all forces on the struggle to avert the imperialist war, to curb the warmongers, now the mobilization of the widest masses for the struggle against the war already being waged, and to bring it to an end, is the prime task of the moment.* Whereas formerly it was a question of barring the road to the onslaught of capital and fascist reaction, now the working class is faced with the task of conducting a most resolute struggle against the regime being established of unbridled terror, oppression and plunder of the popular masses; it is faced with the task of insuring that the ruling classes are prevented from placing the burdens of the war on the backs of the working people.

"Whereas formerly the efforts of

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the working class were directed primarily to the defense of the daily interests of the working people and to guarding them against the plunder and license of the capitalist exploiters—and it was impossible, by virtue of the absence of the necessary preconditions, to place the abolition of capitalist slavery on the order of the day—now, to the extent that the crisis called forth by the war grows deeper, this task will face the working class with ever-growing acuteness." *

* *Ibid.*, p. 15.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ANTI-CAPITALIST SENTIMENT IN GERMANY

BY W. ULBRICHT

THE decisive forces of the German bourgeoisie transferred state power to fascism in 1933 in order to protect the domination of big capital against the growing anti-capitalist forces and to enable German finance capital, under the flag of National-Socialism, to take up the struggle for imperialist domination of Europe. By means of demagogic "anti-capitalist" and pseudo-"Socialist" propaganda, National-Socialism sought to delude the masses into believing that it was fighting for "a new Germany" purportedly differing fundamentally from the capitalist regime. In this way, it wanted to harness broader masses for the aims of German big capital. All the more profound is the disillusionment of many toilers that this policy has led to the intensification of capitalist exploitation in Germany and to imperialist war. Broad masses have learned from experience that neither the road of the "Weimar democracy" nor that of so-called National-Socialism leads to socialism. And on the other side of the "demarcation line," they see more and more clearly and more and more consciously the victory of socialism in the Soviet Union.

Even before the war, anti-capitalist sentiments had penetrated deep into the ranks of the National-Socialist toilers. The deceased Nazi economic specialist, Bernard Koehler, declared in a speech that many National-Socialists think:

". . . there are still highly paid bank directors! Isn't that capitalism? There are still big concerns that squeeze out the small ones! Isn't that capitalism? There are still big stores with large capital that make it hard for the small retailers to exist. There are still government measures that force small entrepreneurs to close down whereas the big ones get the orders. There are no limits to exorbitant profits but very narrow limits to wages! Isn't that capitalism?"

Koehler replies by saying that this is "no capitalism." These remarks, which we take from the Essen *Nationalzeitung* of August 1, show how after six years of fascist "community of interest" propaganda, the class contradictions break through in the very ranks of fascism.

PROLETARIAN OPPOSITIONAL EXPRESSIONS

The war economy has accelerated the intensification of class contradictions in Germany. Anti-capitalist sentiment in the working class

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

increased to such an extent that the press had to take issue with them. Many workers openly posed the question: What do we need big capitalists for? In order to counteract these sentiments, the organ of the fascist German Labor Front, *Ruhrarbeiter*, No. 29 of 1939, even before the outbreak of the war, asked its readers the following question: *"Do we need employers?"* The editors wrote that only a very few are prepared to answer this question without reservation. They further stated that there are opinions which consider the employer a "really superfluous expedient that rides around in a huge automobile, a cigar in his mouth, in order to pocket his surplus value, his profits, all over." At the same time it is said, *"We can do that just as well;* that's no trick, that's only the outrageous manner of *exploitation* which we feel is *unjust* and which has to be abolished." This information of the fascist press confirms the sharpening of class contradictions in Germany.

Not more than two weeks after this question was posed in the paper, such a pack of letters from workers was received that the editors declared themselves perplexed. The letters discussed the problem "with truly impassioned interest." But since this passion was directed against the capitalists and since no worker was ready to defend the employers, the editors were compelled to call upon a few bank directors and capitalist scribes to write on the subject themselves. The editors saw no other way out than to propose to its readers not to think so much about such questions, not to try to lay bare the inner connections of the country's economy, but to occupy themselves with stamp collecting, with the cultivation of vegetables, and other things in their leisure time.

Later on, in August, the newspaper published the replies of numerous directors and capitalist scribes which took up nine full pages of the paper in an effort to prove to the workers the indispensability of the capitalists. These articles show which of the workers' arguments worry the capitalists.

As a rule, the oppositional expressions are directed primarily *against the parasitic manifestations of decaying capitalism,* against the unearned income of the stockholders and the other parasites, who are constantly increasing in number, against corruption and against squandering of the people's wealth through senseless festivals and buildings. Formerly, many workers had believed the Nazi demagogy that capitalism was expressed only in unemployment. But when, as a result of state armament orders, the workers got back into the production process, they discovered that not only did exploitation by the capitalists assume unprecedented proportions but that the capitalists could do this by appealing to the laws and decrees of the "National-Socialist" state.

Workers who are still under National-Socialist influence point out in communications to the press that "many tasks of the entrepreneur today are handled by the state; for example, determining what is produced, providing work, allotting raw material, setting prices, determining wages, etc."

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

From this they draw the conclusion that *the capitalists are superfluous* because they live only from exploitation of the workers. What are the deeper causes of these expressions of opinion?

NATIONAL-SOCIALIST ECONOMIC POLICY

Under the fascist rule, a far-reaching *concentration of capital* took place on the one hand, and the *intensified exploitation of the workers* as well as the *proletarianization of parts of the petty-bourgeoisie*, on the other. By means of the so-called Goering Plan, compulsory cartelization was carried through in important industries. In contrast to the former lying propaganda of the Nazis "against the big stockholders," their power was extended. The "Fuehrer principle" was introduced into the stock companies. The chairman and board members, hence the biggest shareholders, were given dictatorial powers. The fascist bureaucrats grabbed the most profitable posts in the stock companies. This process was accelerated by the expropriation of the Jewish capitalists. When German imperialism annexed Austria and Czechoslovakia, the representatives of the Dresden Bank, the Steel Trust, the Chemical Trust, the Krupp Works, followed on the heels of the troops in order to appropriate the banks and big plants. The state apparatus had never been used so systemmatically for the strengthening of big capital in Germany as under the rule of National-Socialism. The countless economic laws of the so-called "Four Year Plan" served to intensify the exploitation of the workers as well as to plunder the peasants and middle class.

The Nazis sought to cloak the increase in the power of monopoly capital by propaganda "against liberal capitalism." They criticized the capitalism of the early period when the employers could pursue their own private capitalist interests without ties to cartels and concerns. But this position against liberal early-capitalist forms was not, as many toilers assumed, a position against capitalism itself but only a criticism of outmoded capitalist forms. It served as an excuse for the further existence of big capitalist trusts and banks, for the increased concentration of capital and for a war economy. The declaration of the Nazis that they had replaced the economy of liberal capitalism by "National-Socialist economy" only meant that the total capital was in the clutches of a few hundred large capitalist beasts of prey.

The toilers soon recognized the so-called "providing of work" as war production swallowing up men and materials, and the "planned economy" propagated with so much bluster proved to be, as the *Deutsche Allgemeine Zeitung* wrote, an "economy of want." The system of food-rationing cards is characteristic of this. The utter senselessness of this economy is shown in the fact that the toilers have to wear clothes made of poor substitute material although there is sufficient wool on the world market. The adulteration of means of subsistence has become an activity promoted by the state and the replacement of natural products by chemical substitutes is glorified.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Even the production apparatus was systemmatically ruined because repairs were not undertaken in time, substitute parts were not supplied and used up machines were not replaced by new ones. The individual entrepreneurs were advised to restrict production for mass consumption so that the armament orders could be executed immediately.

The so-called "planning" proves to be the planned domination of the economy and the entire political and social life by the biggest owners of capital. National-Socialism, which once had demogogically declared that the economy must serve the people, now openly declares that the consuming power of the toilers must be restricted "in the interest of the planned economy." It praises the cannon production of Krupp and the West Wall fortifications as the "wealth" that was created "for the people." The economic editor of the *Voelkischer Beobachter,* Nonnenbruch, in his book *Dynamic Economy,* wrote concerning the "meaning" of this National-Socialist economic policy:

"The war has brought out sharply the peculiarity of our technical economy. The economy lives from production and the utilization of goods is subordinate to the necessity of production and, indeed, to such an extent, that these goods could even be *exploded. Actually, the people's consuming power is not increased by this production but at least they get work."*

The insanity of this National-Socialist economy reaches its peak in the war. The war makes the masses think more deeply about the causes of their misery. The Nazi leaders drum it into them that "Western capitalism" has unleashed this war. But the toilers ask themselves: Is "our" capitalism any better than "Western" capitalism? Are the German capitalists any different from the English or French? The dialectics of development consists in the fact that National-Socialism, which had gone forth to save capitalism, drove the capitalist contradictions to such a head that its "anti-capitalist" demagogy is proving a boomerang to it, that it is itself thrusting the question on the masses now: *What kind of state is it whose policy serves the big capitalists?*

There is a profound historical connection between the discussion in the Ruhr district on the question "do we need employers," that is, do we need capitalists, and the answer given to it in the factory meetings of the liberated Western Ukraine. Here also, the employers sought to convince the workers that great cares were bound up with the management of a plant, to which the workers replied that they would be glad to relieve the employers of these cares so that production could finally be carried on for the use of the people. Can there be any doubt that the German workers and the German toilers would be just as capable of relieving the employers of "their cares" and of turning over the management of production to the entire people? It is very illuminating that a National-Socialist factory foreman poses the question in the fascist newspaper *Ruhrarbeiter,* No. 33 of 1939: *"How would the economy turn out if the employers were liquidated?"*

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

It can be seen from the articles in the fascist press that the workers continually ask the question, "Why are the factories the personal property of the capitalists?"; "What right have the stockholders to their high profits while the workers' wages are kept low?"; "Aren't the workers really being skinned?" The organ of the German Labor Front, the *Ruhrarbeiter,* was compelled to publish the letter of a reader which states that the infuriating fact of the high incomes of the bank directors is enraging many workers:

"There are certainly still some among the stockholders who became moneybags at the expense of the emaciated people in the war and during the period of inflation. These moneybags would have had everything taken away from them at that time through taxation by a just government for the general good. If all the guilt on earth were to be avenged then *these moneybags would also have to be kept in jail for the length of time that they had waxed fat at the expense of others.*"

The workers recall the earlier promises of the fascist leaders and quote from their former articles against the millionaires; they spread the newspaper reports about the increase in profits of the stock companies and want to know who is *profiting* from the war and who is *paying* for the war: What kind of "socialism" is it in which the workers have nothing to say, in which the capitalist "factory fuehrer" has unrestricted command? What kind of "socialism" is it in which wages and salaries are reduced while, at the same time, dividends are paid out to the capitalist parasites? What kind of "socialism" is it in which the artisans are expropriated while the big capitalists are being constantly enriched by new sources of profit? What kind of "socialism" is it that keeps Communists in concentration camps, that refuses to grant freedom to such a faithful and tested fighter for socialism as Ernst Thaelmann?

The Nazi press is deaf to all these questions and only seeks convulsively to prove that there is simply no more capitalist exploitation. It writes: "The wage level is not decisive in whether or not the worker is exploited."

The answer causes the workers all the more to ask the question as to how it happens that though they produce more, their wages do not increase, the capitalist owners of the factory, though scarcely concerning themselves with the factory, receive higher profits.

The war nourishes the anti-capitalist sentiments. The privations of the masses force a comparison between the life of the armament capitalists who pocket enormous profits, of the Nazi bigwigs who provide adequately for themselves in the hinterland, and the masses who must forego the barest necessities while working hard. In order to counteract this dissatisfaction, Nonnenbruch declares in the *Voelkischer Beobachter* of September 19:

"The simplification of our habits of consumption contribute substantially towards the inner unification of the people and towards the complete elimination of class differences."

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

He goes on to paint the picture of a general director who allegedly will be wearing a patched suit and draws the conclusion that this education in the war "gives the guarantee for a really popular form of consumption." They call this "popular socialism." The legendary "general director with patched pants" is the mournful embodiment of this astounding "socialism."

THE GERMAN MASSES LOOK TO THE SOVIET UNION

Today, however, *the example of socialism in the Soviet Union* makes it evident to the German toilers that socialism is not "simplification of the habits of consumption" and the card-system. The *luxury* of the old master class has indeed disappeared; but in its place, increasing well-being is developing on the basis of the abolition of capitalist property in the means of production.

The leading article of the Berlin *Angriff* of September 13, 1939, reflects the strength of the socialist sentiments among the working masses of Germany since the outbreak of the war. In the endeavor to lure the masses to support the imperialist war policy, the author declares that socialism *"really represents the only possible mode of life for modern peoples."* And he goes on to say:

". . . At a time when the modern airplane contracts all boundaries and thereby the customs barriers as well, Europe imperatively demands a new order, within the nations themselves as well as in international commerce. Besides—and this seems to be the prerequisite for this new order—the turn towards the socialist people's state and away from international exploiting capitalism is unmistakable."

This propaganda resembles very much the efforts of the Social-Democratic leaders in the first imperialist World War to win the workers, by means of pseudo-socialist propaganda, to "hold out." Immediately *after* the war, these people were particularly zealous in glorifying the capitalist conditions in Germany as "socialistic" and issued the slogan "socialism is on the march!"

While the English and French imperialists are purportedly waging an "anti-fascist" war, a war in "defense of democracy," the German imperialists are purportedly waging a war against "Western capitalism." And while the English and French imperialists are abolishing the democratic rights of the toilers in their own countries, the German imperialists are intensifying capitalist exploitation to an unbearable degree. But the German workers, the German toilers, see in socialism more and more the only way out of all this misery which is becoming truly frightful as a result of the war. They look more and more closely to the Soviet Union, the land of victorious socialism. Only a short time ago, they were told that starvation and anarchy reign in the Soviet Union. Now they learn, even from the Nazi press, what a rich land the Soviet Union is, what mighty work of construction socialism has achieved, what gigantic economic, political and military power has grown up out of the socialist revolution.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

It must have moved the German toilers to profound reflection that the capitalists and large landowners fled from the territories of the former Polish prison of nations freed by the Soviet Union, whereas in the areas occupied by Germany, the workers and peasants look longingly across the border where capitalism ends and socialism begins. The German toilers could convince themselves that in the territories freed by the Soviet Union, a new world is arising, the world of socialism, whereas in the territories occupied by Germany, capitalism is maintained intact. And the question persists: Why do we need capitalists on this side of the border that are superfluous on the other side of the border, the side of the great land where the workers and peasants rule?

The Nazis have promised the masses to abolish the old reactionary powers and to establish a truly *new Germany*. During six and a half years of experience, the masses could convince themselves that the old big capitalist powers continue to rule in Germany, that they exploit the toilers worse than ever and sacrifice country and people for their imperialist interests. The Nazis speak with great pathos of their "dynamics," of the dynamic power with which they are enlarging Germany. But this "dynamic power" has led the German people into the horrors of war. The German soldiers have learned from experience in Austria and Czechoslovakia that the "dynamics" of the conquerors leads only to the disappearance of the means of subsistence and to increased exploitation, that it does not win the peoples for Germany but only calls forth their deepest hatred. Today, they are learning how, in contrast to this, the workers' and peasants' Red Army really stimulates all the peoples' energies in liberated Western Ukraine and West Byelo-Russia and, in a short time, calls forth a magnificent transformation in the life of the people, in the economy and in the cultural sphere. Many German soldiers who met the hatred of the population saw, while marching back to the Polish line of demarcation, how the toiling people enthusiastically greeted the Soviet troops as their liberators. If the abolition of the capitalists and large landowners in these areas calls forth such tremendous creative initiative of the masses, imagine what it would be in Germany, in this highly developed land with its advanced technique!

The war has shaken the German people so profoundly that even in the ranks of the Nazi Party deep fissures are arising between those who support the "fine gentlemen," the capitalists, and those who are in earnest about the struggle for the socialist interests of the toilers and the struggle against capitalism. Disillusioned by the failure of the Nazi bigwigs to fulfil their promises, aroused by the unparalleled collapse of almost the entire ideology with which they had been misled for years, many National-Socialist toilers are more inclined to hear the truth about the struggle for socialism and about the land of socialist democracy. It depends upon the political clarity and the strength of the revolutionary forces to what ex-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tent they succeed in giving a revolutionary socialist content to the desire of the National-Socialist toilers for a new, better Germany, in freeing them from their petty-bourgeois illusions. The countless daily conflicts between the toilers and the capitalist system in the factory, in the Labor Front, and in the other mass organizations, will help the masses find the right road. Malicious joy, sectarian talk to such toilers, "that's the way you wanted it," is especially harmful in this situation.

The Non-Aggression Pact between the Soviet Union and Germany is of the utmost importance for the German toilers. In contrast to the German imperialists who regard this pact solely as a means of carrying through their policy, the German workers and the great mass of other toilers see in this pact the basis of a profound, indestructible friendship with the great Soviet people. Despite their war against "Western capitalism," the German imperialists remain inseparably bound up with world capitalism, but the German workers, the German toilers, will never relinquish their ties with the land of socialism and will do everything to make their bond of friendship with the Soviet Union *irrevocable*.

And with what enthusiasm the toiling *youth* of Germany will wage the struggle against the old capitalist powers! The honest hatred of the German youth for capitalist reaction which the German imperialists are attempting fraudulently to turn into hatred for "the capitalist Western powers" can bring about a great transformation some day. Instead of witnessing the promised "young Germany," the German youth are now being driven into the trenches. The majority of the German youth who really despise capitalism, who really see their ideal in socialism, who yearn for a really *new* Germany, will recognize, under the conditions of the war, the abyss into which the prevailing system has led them and will become profoundly receptive to the heroic tasks of the revolutionary struggle for socialism.

The crisis of capitalism, accelerated and intensified as a result of the war, will convince the toiling masses of dying capitalism's insanity and its animosity to the people. German capitalism, which once achieved a tremendous industrial upsurge, has, in its last imperialist phase, become not only an obstacle to the development of economy but the destroyer of Germany. It is the historic task of the German working class, which has been steeled in decades of struggle, to prepare itself, in this war, for the decisive battle against capitalism. The example of the victory of socialism in the Soviet Union shows the German workers and peasants the road to the fulfillment of their historic task.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ON BOURGEOIS AND BOURGEOIS-DEMOCRATIC REVOLUTIONS

BY EMILIAN YAROSLAVSKY

A STUDY of the history of the U.S.S.R., as of any country, requires a delineation of the social content of each individual revolution. The very word *revolution* means a fundamental, sharp overturn, an abrupt transition (leap) in production relations, to a more progressive type, or from one political system to another, more progressive, system. Prior to the socialist revolution, bourgeois revolutions occurred which replaced feudal relations by bourgeois relations. Of this kind were the English bourgeois revolution in the seventeenth century, the French bourgeois revolution in 1789, and the revolutions of 1848 in Central Europe.

The main issue in a revolution is that of the conquest of power, of the passage of power from one class to another. In bourgeois revolutions this transfer of power passes from the feudal lords, the nobility, to the bourgeoisie, merchant and industrial.

In defining revolution Marx pointed out that at a certain stage of their development the material forces of production in society come in conflict with the existing production relations. Juridically expressed, the material forces of production in society come in conflict with the property relations within which they have hitherto developed. When these relations are transformed from forms of development into obstacles to the development of the productive forces, revolution sets in.

This does not mean that the matured revolution takes place automatically by peaceful means. The revolutionary transfer of power from one class to another is accompanied by violence against the class ruling heretofore by the class advancing to power, and is frequently accompanied by civil war. Rarely is such a transition achieved without the most stubborn resistance by the class overthrown, in armed struggle between the contending forces.

But not every violent overthrow of one class by another can be called a revolution. There is a type of revolt by a class formerly in power or by some other reactionary class striving to restore the old order and to deprive the progressive class of its achievements. When this type of revolt is taken up against a more progressive class in power, then such a struggle between the classes, directed against the revolu-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tion, or against the social system that is already in being and has been created by revolution, is called *counter-revolution*. This is the case even though the counter-revolutionaries themselves frequently call such a revolt a revolution. Thus, the German and Italian fascists call the counter-revolutionary revolt organized by them a revolution, and the German fascists call the counter-revolution carried through by them a "National-Socialist" revolution.

It is necessary to distinguish the concept of *reaction* from that of counter-revolution. The same class, once in power, may cast aside its program after the revolution, go backward, and deprive the people of certain of their achievements. Then we say that *reaction has set in*. That, for example, was the case after the defeat of the 1905 Revolution, when tsarism withdrew all the concessions it had made in 1905 and meted out punishment to the revolutionary organizations of the workers and peasants. When dying classes fight to maintain power, they carry through a reactionary policy.

All these concepts—revolution, counter-revolution, reaction—must be strictly distinguished in studying the history of the U.S.S.R. or of other countries and peoples.

In August, 1934, Comrades Stalin, Zhdanov and Kirov, expressing their views on the plan for a textbook on the history of the U.S.S.R., pointed out that one must not confuse the concepts of reaction and counter-revolution, revolution "in general," bourgeois revolution, and bourgeois-democratic revolution.

The *character* of a revolution is ascertained by determining which are *the driving forces* of the revolution. We call the driving forces of a revolution the classes that play an active part in the revolutionary movement or guide the movement. Thus, in the French bourgeois revolution of 1789 the driving forces were the entire so-called "Third Estate," *i.e.*, the big, middle, and petty bourgeoisie. In 1792 masses of workers and handicraftsmen in the towns to a considerable degree joined with this middle, big, and petty bourgeoisie. In the bourgeois-democratic revolution in Russia in 1905 the main driving forces were the proletariat and the peasantry, the alliance between these two classes, although, to be sure, this alliance was by no means fully consolidated at that time; it was thoroughly established only in 1917.

Now that we have briefly defined the meaning of revolution "in general" as well as of reaction and counter-revolution, let us deal with the differences between bourgeois revolution and bourgeois-democratic revolution.

The bourgeois revolutions of the past—of the seventeenth, eighteenth and nineteenth centuries—should not be placed on the same plane; they differ one from the other.

Marx pointed out that "we must not confuse the Prussian March Revolution either with the English Revolution of 1648 or the French Revolution of 1789. . . . Far from being a European revolution, it constituted only a weak echo of the European revolution in a backward country. Instead of outdistancing its age, it was more than half a century behind it. From the very outset it was a throwback." *(In the Epoch of*

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the German Revolution of 1848 and 1850, Russian.)

This indicates that the Revolution of 1848 differs in some ways from the bourgeois English Revolution of 1648 and from the French Revolution of 1789, although both the latter were bourgeois revolutions.

We shall soon deal with these differences. Let us here recall that Lenin, in his article, "Revolution of the 1789 or 1848 Type?" written in 1905, commented on these differences as follows:

"The important question regarding the Russian Revolution consists of the following:

"1. Will it go as far as the *complete* overthrow of the tsarist government, as far as a republic, or

"2. Will it stop with curtailing, limiting the tsar's power, with a monarchist constitution?

"Or, to put it in another way: are we fated to have a revolution of the 1789 type or of the 1848 type?* (We say: *type,* so as to eliminate the absurd thought of the possibility of the recurrence of the social, political, and international situation of the years 1789 and 1848, that has gone never to return.)"**

Thus, Lenin also sharply differentiated the bourgeois revolution of 1848 in Germany from the bourgeois revolution in France in 1789.

But wherein lies the difference? Lenin briefly explained it as follows: the Great French Revolution advanced as far as the *complete overthrow of the royal power.* King Louis XVI was seized by the people and executed on the public square. The royal power was destroyed. But in March, 1848, in Germany, the revolution was a miscarriage or, as Marx expressed it, a "throwback." It only went as far as limiting the royal power by parliament, and achieved only some concessions for the bourgeoisie from the royal power and the nobility.

Wherein lies the distinction between this revolution of 1848 and the revolution in England in the seventeenth century, of which Marx spoke? In the fact that in England the industrial and merchant bourgeoisie, led by Oliver Cromwell, executed the King and, to a far greater degree than was done by the 1848 revolution in Germany, smashed the power of the feudal lords.

But within the bourgeois French Revolution itself one must note the varying significance of events: July, 1789, when the people seized the Bastille; and August, 1792, when France ceased to be a monarchy and became a republic, when the bourgeois party of the Girondist conciliators was overthrown and the more revolutionary party of the Jacobins came to power, supported by the peasants and workers. In 1789 the *whole* of the bourgeoisie took action against the feudal lords, the nobility, and priesthood, whereas in 1792 the *petty*-bourgeoisie took the lead, supported by *the workers and peasants and a considerable section of the intelligentsia.* This was another form of the bourgeois revolution, namely, the *bourgeois-democratic revolution.*

In what way, both as to form and content, did the latter differ from

* "Here the words 'or 1871' may be added. We must regard this question as a likely *objection* from many non-Social-Democrats" (Lenin).

** Lenin, *Collected Works,* Vol. VII, p. 181, Russian edition.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the revolution of 1789? In the fact that *in 1792 wider masses of the people, the lower strata of the people, came forward with their own independent demands and put their impress on the entire further course of the revolution.*

Lenin noted these two different stages of the bourgeois revolution in France—July, 1789, and August, 1792—and, as we have seen, sharply differentiated between the 1848 revolution in Germany and the bourgeois revolution of 1789 in France.

Where does he do so, the reader will ask. Here is the answer.

In 1906 the Mensheviks put forward the slogan of the need to exert pressure on the Russian government through the State Duma. In reply Lenin wrote:

"You want to exert pressure immediately?—then prepare an uprising, preach it, organize it. In it alone lies the possibility that the Duma comedy will not be the end of the Russian bourgeois revolution, but will become the beginning of a complete democratic revolution that will set alight the flames of proletarian revolutions throughout the world. In it alone lies the guarantee that our 'united Landtag' * will become the prelude to a Constituent Assembly of a non-Frankfurt type, that the revolution will not end with a mere March 18 (1848), that we will not have only a July 14 (1789) but also an August 10 (1792)." **

As we see, Lenin drew a sharp distinction between the various stages in the development of the French bourgeois revolution of 1789. This revolution, in August, 1792, became a bourgeois-democratic revolution, *i.e.*, a really popular revolution.

We find that Comrade Stalin gave a similar estimation of the French bourgeois revolution when, in his talk with H. G. Wells, he noted its democratic character. Speaking of this revolution, Comrade Stalin pointed out:

"Long before 1789 it was clear to many how rotten the royal power, the feudal system was. But a popular insurrection, a clash of classes, was not, could not be avoided." *

But why the need for a popular revolution?

"Because the classes which must abandon the stage of history are the last to become convinced that their role is ended. . . . That is why dying classes take to arms and resort to every means to save their existence as a ruling class." *

In reply to Wells' remark that there were quite a number of lawyers at the head of the Great French Revolution, Comrade Stalin answered:

"Do you deny the role of the intelligentsia in revolutionary movements? Was the Great French Revolution a lawyers' revolution and not a popular revolution, which achieved victory by rousing the vast masses of the people against feudalism and championed the interests of the Third Estate?" *

Does Comrade Stalin deny the bourgeois character of the Great French Revolution? No, on the con-

* The parliament in Frankfurt, Germany, a product of the March, 1848, Revolution.—*E. Y.*

** Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. VIII, p. 215, Russian edition.

* J. V. Stalin, *Marxism vs. Liberalism, an Interview*, p. 18, International Publishers, 1935.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

trary, he points out the need to stress the bourgeois character of this revolution. But at the same time he remarks that it was a popular revolution; and a popular revolution is a bourgeois-democratic revolution.

Consequently, in the bourgeois revolutions of the past we must also separate from the general concept of the bourgeois revolution its special aspect, namely, the bourgeois-democratic revolution, *i.e., the popular revolution.*

Lenin defines the concept of the bourgeois-democratic revolution with absolute precision. In his splendid work *State and Revolution,* written in 1917, Lenin, in discussing Marx's expression that the proletariat needs "to break up the bureaucratic and military (state) machinery" created before it by the exploiting classes, pointed to the difference between a really popular revolution and the bourgeois revolution in the way it is generally understood. Let us quote this extract in full:

". . . particular attention should be given to Marx's extremely profound remark that the destruction of the military and bureaucratic apparatus of the state is 'the precondition of any real *people's* revolution.' This idea of a 'people's' revolution seems strange on Marx's lips, and the Russian Plekhanovists and Mensheviks, those followers of Struve who wish to be considered Marxists, might possibly declare such an expression to be a 'slip of the tongue.' They have reduced Marxism to such a state of poverty-stricken 'liberal' distortion that nothing exists for them beyond the distinction between bourgeois and proletarian revolution—and even that distinction they understand in an entirely lifeless way.

"If we take for examples the revolutions of the twentieth century, we shall, of course, have to recognize both the Portuguese and the Turkish revolutions as bourgeois. Neither, however, is a 'people's' revolution, inasmuch as the mass of the people, the enormous majority, does not make its appearance actively, independently, with its own economic and political demands, in either the one or the other. On the other hand, the Russian bourgeois revolution of 1905-1907, although it presented no such 'brilliant' successes as at times fell to the lot of the Portuguese and Turkish revolutions, was undoubtedly a real 'people's' revolution, since the mass of the people, the majority, the lowest social 'depths,' crushed down by oppression and exploitation, were rising independently, since they put on the entire course of the revolution a stamp of *their* demands, *their* attempts at building up, in their own way, a new society in place of the old society that was being shattered." *

Consequently, Lenin considered it wrong for leading people in the labor movement, Communists or Socialists, not to be able to distinguish between the varying types of revolutions, but only to know the difference between the bourgeois and the proletarian revolutions. Lenin called it a "miserably liberal distortion" of Marxism for a Marxist historian not to see any differences between revolutions "other than the contrast between the bourgeois and proletarian revolutions." Lenin demanded that the content of the

* Lenin, *State and Revolution,* pp. 34-35. International Publishers.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

bourgeois revolution should in each given case be subjected to analysis and investigation, so as to discover whether or not it was a popular democratic revolution.

Thus, we find that Lenin, like Marx and Stalin, defined the bourgeois-democratic revolution as a *popular revolution.* This is the sort of revolution in which power passes from the feudal lords, nobility and church into the hands of a new class.

It is thus possible to have bourgois revolutions which are not democratic revolutions, *i.e.,* not really popular revolutions. Lenin pointed to such revolutions as the Portuguese and Turkish revolutions. Following Marx, Lenin also indicated the bourgeois revolution of 1848 in Germany.

Sometimes power can pass from one exploiting group to another by means of a *palace revolution.* The Portuguese revolution mentioned by Lenin was to a considerable degree a revolution of this kind. The masses of the people did not take part in this revolution, did not place on it the impress of their demands, of their endeavors to build a new society after their own fashion.

It is well-known that Lenin considered the 1905 Revolution a bourgeois-democratic revolution, although, like Comrade Stalin, he called it a bourgeois revolution on more than one occasion and pointed out that it had, to a considerable degree, a peasant character. At the Fourth (Unity) Congress of the Russian Social-Democratic Labor Party, held at Stockholm, Plekhanov declared in favor of such seizure of power as the Convention of the Great French Revolution (established in 1792). Lenin, taking advantage of this statement of Plekhanov, declared himself in favor of such seizure of power. In reporting on this Congress, Lenin told how Plekhanov had stated:

" 'I am against seizing power like a band of conspirators; but I am entirely in favor of such seizure of power as was, for example, the Convention in the Great French Revolution.' "

Lenin then commented:

"We seized upon this statement of Plekhanov. 'Splendid, Comrade Plekhanov,' I answered him. 'Write into the resolution what you have just said. Condemn conspiracy-mongering as sharply as you like—we Bolsheviks will vote unanimously and unreservedly for the kind of resolution which would recommend and call upon the proletariat to seize power after the fashion of the Convention. Condemn conspiracy-mongering, but recognize in the resolution a dictatorship like the Convention, and we will be fully and unconditionally in agreement with you. . . !' "

Lenin went on to explain:

"The Convention was a dictatorship of the submerged, *i.e.,* the very lowest strata of the urban and village poor. In the bourgeois revolution it was just the kind of sovereign institution in which full and undivided power was held, not by the big or middle bourgeoisie, but by the common people, the poor, *i.e.,* those whom we call 'the proletariat and peasantry' . . . and the Bolsheviks have at all times spoken of the conquest of power precisely by the masses of the people, precisely by

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the proletariat and peasantry, and not at all by a 'conscious minority' of one kind or another." *

These were the special features that Lenin saw in the transition of the bourgeois French Revolution of 1789 to the democratic revolution in August, 1792, when it assumed a really democratic character, expressed in the establishment of the Convention and in the role played in it by the urban and village poor.

Let us turn to the 1905 Revolution and to the Revolution of February, 1917. Both were bourgeois revolutions; but at the same time, both were bourgeois-democratic revolutions. Lenin wrote that one could not speak of a repetition of 1789 or 1848, since both the 1905 and 1917 revolutions took place in conditions absolutely different from those of 1789 and 1848.

What were the main points of difference?

First, the revolutions of the seventeenth, eighteenth and nineteenth centuries took place at a time when the bourgeoisie had just come to power, when capitalism was on the upgrade. The 1905 Revolution was the first bourgeois-democratic revolution of the imperialist epoch, the stage of the decline and decay of capitalism. The Revolution of February, 1917, took place when capitalism was in still greater decay and decline than it had been at the time of the 1905 Revolution; for the war of 1914-1918 had sharpened social contradictions to the utmost and had hastened the collapse of the capitalist system.

Secondly, the 1905 Revolution and the Revolution of February, 1917, took place when the bourgeoisie could no longer play the revolutionary role it had played in England and France, and, to some extent, in past revolutions of Central Europe. The Russian bourgeoisie, including the liberal bourgeoisie, was afraid of a popular revolution, for in the period of imperialism a popular bourgeois-democratic revolution would develop into a socialist revolution. The Russian bourgeoisie was not revolutionary.

Thirdly, the bourgeois-democratic revolution against tsarism in Russia was also directed against imperialism.

". . . for whoever overthrew tsarism had at the same time to overthrow imperialism, if his intention really was not only to smash tsarism but to extirpate it without leaving a trace; thus, the revolution against tsarism approximated to and had to grow into a revolution against imperialism, into a proletarian revolution." *

The fourth important distinction was the existence in Russia of a proletariat that came forward as an independent class, as an independent political force. In both the 1905 Revolution and the Revolution of February, 1917, this proletariat was the leading force.

A fifth important distinction was the fact that in both the 1905 Revolution and the Revolution of February, 1917, the proletariat possessed a *workers' party*, an independent political organization with a pro-

* Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. IX, p. 217, Russian edition.

* Stalin, *Leninism*, Vol. I, p. 19. International Publishers.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

gram that stood out in contrast to the programs of all the other parties. It was a Marxist-Leninist Party, a new type of party, based on the most revolutionary theory, a party that had assimilated the tremendous experience of all the revolutions of the past, a party that was irreconcilable and hostile to the bourgeoisie.

Sixthly, in Russia two wars took place: one was against the remnants of feudalism for a republic, for the breaking of all fetters hindering the development of the productive forces of the country; and the other —the war for *socialism*. In the first war against the remnants and survivals of the past the proletariat joined forces with the entire peasantry. The second war, a war for the future, for socialism, united the proletariat with the poorest peasantry and with the semi-proletarian elements of town and country.

All these special features placed their impress on the character of the bourgeois Revolution of 1905 and of the Revolution of February, 1917. These were bourgeois-democratic revolutions which under the conditions of imperialism, under the special conditions of the development of Russia, grew into the socialist revolution and were a stage towards the socialist revolution, were the prelude to it.

Therefore, in his lecture on the 1905 Revolution, delivered at a meeting of young workers in Switzerland, Lenin said, when dealing with the peculiar character of the Russian Revolution of 1905:

"The peculiar feature of the Russian Revolution is that in its social content it was a *bourgeois-democratic* revolution but in its methods of struggle it was a *proletarian* revolution. It was a bourgeois-democratic revolution since the aim toward which it strove directly and which it could reach directly with the aid of its own forces was a democratic republic, an eight-hour day and the confiscation of the immense estates of the nobility—all the measures achieved almost completely in the French bourgeois revolution in 1792 and 1793.

"At the same time the Russian revolution was also a proletarian revolution, not only in the sense that the proletariat was the leading force, the vanguard of the movement, but also in the sense that the specifically proletarian means of struggle—namely, the strike—was the principal instrument employed for rousing the masses and the most characteristic phenomenon in the wave-like rise of decisive events." *

The Mensheviks failed to understand this special character of the 1905 Revolution and considered it an ordinary bourgeois revolution; fearing the socialist revolution, they opposed the need for struggle to develop the bourgeois revolution into a socialist revolution, and failed to see that the proletariat, as the leading force of the revolution, must place a special impress on it. The Mensheviks, on the contrary, strove to ensure that it would not pass at all beyond the bounds of a purely bourgeois revolution, to ensure that the proletariat would yield the leadership to the bourgeoisie.

What then distinguishes the February bourgeois-democratic revolution from the bourgeois-democratic Revolution in 1905?

---

* Lenin, *Selected Works*, Vol. III, pp. 3-4.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

1. In both the chief driving forces were the proletariat and the peasantry. But whereas in the 1905 Revolution the proletariat was unable completely to act as the leading force, because a considerable part of the peasantry still had faith in the tsar, the proletariat was able, in the Revolution of February, 1917, to fulfil completely the role of leading force, for by this time the peasantry had lost its faith in the tsar and joined forces with the working class. As a result, the overwhelming majority of the soldiers and sailors, from the very first days of the 1917 Revolution, joined with the workers and peasants against the monarchy, thereby sealing its fate.

2. In 1905 the uprising against tsardom met with defeat. In 1917 this uprising was victorious, and the monarchy was overthrown. In 1905 workers' and soldiers' Soviets of Deputies had barely emerged; they were unable to play the role they were to have in 1917. In 1917, after the overthrow of the monarchy, these Soviets became organs of power. True, at the beginning a dual power was established, but in the course of the summer of 1917, the bourgeois-democratic revolution developed into a socialist revolution and the bourgeoisie was overthrown by the October Socialist Revolution, which laid the basis for the epoch of socialism and Soviet power.

3. In 1905 the borgeois-democratic revolution was "proletarian," not only in the sense that the proletariat was the leading force, the vanguard of the movement, "but also in the sense that the specifically proletarian means of struggle, the strike, was the principal weapon employed for rousing the masses and the most characteristic phenomenon in the wave-like rise of decisive events"; in 1917, on the other hand, the proletariat left a still more profound impress on the entire movement, since it proved the vital power of the highest form of the revolutionary struggle—the armed uprising.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ANTI-TRUST LAWS AND THE ATTACK ON LABOR

BY HARRY MARTEL

THE Roosevelt Administration, proceeding to put into effect the program of the reactionary magnates, has launched an attack on the labor movement which threatens the independence of the whole of organized labor, C.I.O., A. F. of L., and the Railroad Brotherhoods. Through the anti-trust division of the Department of Justice, it is invoking the Sherman Act against trade unions in nearly every state, despite labor's just contention that this Act never was intended to apply to labor, but was drawn up for the exclusive purpose of curbing trustified capital.

This invocation of the Sherman Anti-Trust Law by Attorney-General Murphy and by Assistant Attorney-General Thurman Arnold is not at all accidental. It comes at a time when the class forces of our country are moving into position on the basis of the imperialist war, of the decisive role of the Soviet Union, and of the golden imperialist opportunities for the American bourgeoisie provided by the war. The war camp, headed by the economic overlords of our country, is using the Administration to provide the conditions necessary for the fulfillment of war aims which are in profound opposition to the needs of the American people. The use of the Sherman Act against the labor movement is but part of the strategy already worked out by Wall Street to accomplish its imperialist aims.

The full meaning of Thurman Arnold's recent letter to the Central Labor Union of Indianapolis and of Frank Murphy's confirmation of the former's menacing remarks can be discovered only in its connection with the war plans of American imperialism. It is no secret that the War Department, with the full endorsement and cooperation of Roosevelt, has worked out a plan of imperialist dictatorship. This scheme, called the "M-Day Plan," sets up a war economy in which labor will be completely geared to the war machine. General Hugh S. Johnson, who is in a position to know, has bluntly stated that "the necessary plans and drafts of statutes for a practical economic dictatorship are all there down to the last comma, period, eye-dot and T-cross." (*New York World-Telegram,* December 12.)

In the light of the "M-Day Plan"

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the anti-labor drive of the Department of Justice is seen to be of a piece with the specious indictment of Earl Browder; with the attacks by the Dies Committee on Communists, the C.I.O., and progressive organizations; with the smearing of the National Labor Relations Board by the Smith Investigating Committee; especially with the Administration's announced intention to curtail expenditures on relief, W.P.A., P.W.A., and all other "non-defense" needs. The anti-labor drive is in line with the Administration's furious lunges at the Soviet Union. In short, the Department of Justice and the other agencies of government are waging war on the entire American working class, scuttling the Bill of Rights, discarding the progressive measures of the former New Deal policy, and sacrificing the people's need for social security to the greed of monopoly capital.

THE MURPHY-ARNOLD PERVERSION OF THE ANTI-TRUST LAWS

The Roosevelt Administration is cynically stripping itself daily of its "liberal" pretensions. When such a Roosevelt man as Frank Murphy can tell organized labor that the Department of Justice intends to watch out for "violations of criminal statutes" on the part of labor unions and to "follow the constructions placed on them by the Supreme Court," he in effect says that he intends to follow those judicial interpretations of the Sherman Act which have been a scandal in American legal history. Small wonder that both he and Arnold have received an excellent press from such organs of reaction as the *Wall Street Journal*, *The New York Times*, the *Herald Tribune* and the *World-Telegram*. Their statements indicate that labor is to be assailed by all the weapons provided by the Supreme Court in its most reactionary days. Truly the "liberal" Roosevelt Government has undergone a drastic sea-change in its approach toward labor.

Of course, both Murphy and Arnold say that their views on the application of the Sherman Act to labor are ultimately beneficial to labor itself. This cheap demagogic assertion holds no more water than does the assertion by Big Business that, if it is left free to do what it wants, unemployment will be eliminated and prosperity will be assured to all. It is likewise pure demagogy on the part of the Department of Justice to announce that it is only interested in preferring indictments against racketeers in the trade unions who violate the Sherman Act. No one has fought more courageously and persistently for the elimination of trade union racketeers than the Communists. Indeed, their efforts have resulted in the elimination of more of these capitalist-minded crooks than all the state and government agencies put together have ever done. But the point that must be stressed here is that racketeers in trade unions can be dealt with in an adequately legal manner without applying the Sherman Anti-Trust Laws to them and the unions they unfortunately mislead. Henry Epstein, the New York State Solicitor General, has stated that racketeers and extortionists and illegal price-fixers, who are listed by Thurman Arnold as

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

subject to the Sherman Act, can be "adequately met by the criminal statutes dealing with extortion and criminal conspiracy." (Letter to the *New York Times*, November 26.) But the times are such that an Arnold can wrap himself in the robes of legal infallibility to the applause of reactionaries who don't care what the law says provided it can be made use of against the working class.

The magnates who control the workings of the government are quite concerned over the bluster of the anti-trust division that has already resulted in the indictment of twelve corporations and 103 individuals in the glassware industry. In the first place, it is only a suit in equity, not a criminal indictment; in the second place, those indicted know that, whatever the result of the case, not one penny of dividends from the glass business will be interfered with. Further, it serves as a smokescreen to blind the people to the real aims of the Department of Justice. The history of American trusts and of the Sherman and Clayton Acts reveals the fact that trusts have in no wise suffered through these Acts.

The point that particularly interests the magnates of trustified capital is the promise by the administration that it will exploit, in order to weaken organized labor, the legalisms used by the Supreme Court since 1895 to fulfil the desires of Big Capital. That Court's previous twists of words to pervert the intent of the Sherman Act have shocked even bourgeois writers. Harold Underwood Faulkner, the historian, comes to the point when he says: "While the Sherman Act had little influence upon business consolidations, it is the irony of fate that capital has succeeded in using it effectively against labor." (*American Economic History*, p. 539.)

Murphy, as a devoted servitor of the capitalist class, promises to do all he can to whip labor into submission. To labor, however, he tries to appear as a paragon of duty. Attempting to conceal his role as prosecutor of labor, he says that: "The policy of enforcement should not vary according to the individual views of the official charged with enforcement." But this face-saver will not save Murphy's affectation of "progressivism." Thurman Arnold answered Murphy's argument a few years ago in these words: "Often he [the prosecutor] may be compelled by outside agencies actually to attempt to enforce laws which promote dissension and public disorder rather than social security." (Article, "Law Enforcement," *Encyclopedia of Social Sciences.)*

Certainly the application of the Sherman Act to trade unions does not promote social security. Then why do Murphy and Arnold pledge themselves to apply it to labor? Is it because they were "compelled by outside agencies" to do so? The blame is entirely Arnold's if we suspect that the compulsion has come from the monopolists, the "economic royalists," to use the language of Roosevelt before he nodded his head in prayer for the royal (and economic) heads of the British Empire.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE STRANGE HISTORY OF THE SHERMAN ACT

The history of the Sherman Act affords a classic illustration of class justice under bourgeois democracy. Passed in 1890 when class lines in the United States were becoming sharply drawn as a result of the disappearance of the frontier and the growth of large corporations which threatened the existence of the small business man and the farmer, the anti-trust law was the swan-song of the epoch of capitalism marked by free competition. It denoted the beginning of the epoch of American imperialism. Expressing the resentment of the people toward the land-grabbing of the railroads, the gouging practices of the corporations, and the monopolistic control of the market by the beef, oil, tobacco, and other trusts, the Act was designed to protect the people "against oppressive monopolies." Misgivings in the Senate that the wording of the bill might operate against combinations of workingmen were declared by Senator Sherman to be without foundation. He said that the wording was not the main point. Any Senator was invited to put stronger "medicine" into the language of the bill if he could. The important thing, Sherman affirmed, was to get after the trusts, those business combinations that were ruining the country. As far as trade unions were concerned, "combinations of workingmen to promote their interests, promote their welfare, and increase their pay . . . are not affected in the slightest degree, nor can they be included in the words of the intent of the bill as now reported." (*Congressional Record*, V. 21, Part. 3, p. 2563, 1890.)

The bill was clearly an anti-trust bill. But some Senators evidently knew what happens to legislative intent when the capitalists intend something else. Senator Stewart, in the course of the debate on the bill, boldly stated: "Accumulated wealth has the power to prosecute, and if the laborers combine *in any form* [my italics—H.M.] to protect themselves there will be found means of prosecuting them." And, indeed, the application of the Act showed that "accumulated wealth" found the means and the agencies, the courts and the Department of Justice, for prosecuting and persecuting labor under the Sherman Act.

The courts had a twofold task with reference to this Act. They had to safeguard the trusts from prosecution, on the one hand, and to transform the statute into an anti-labor law, on the other. The first task was accomplished by stretching legal ingenuity to the sticking point.

The people hated all trusts as destroyers of individual property and American democracy and their hatred was expressed in the anti-trust law. But the courts said the people were really opposed only to "bad" trusts. The people were opposed to all restraint of trade by monopolists; but the courts said the people really meant that they are opposed only to "unreasonable" restraint of trade. These distinctions between "good" and "bad" trusts, between "reasonable" and unreasonable" restraints of trade have since 1911 been denominated

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

"the rule of reason." The discovery of this amazing bourgeois legal principle indicated that legal ideas did not lag far behind the development of finance capital in the United States. They reflected very faithfully the needs of the trusts, and went directly counter to the needs of the people.

In 1912 the courts blandly perfected their legal *legerdemain* by declaring that, after all, the anti-trust laws were not so much concerned with "the intent to monopolize" or with certain allegedly bad practices, as with the aim of these practices. The main question was: Did the Terminal Railroad Association of St. Louis have a "good aim"? The Supreme Court of the United States decided that it did and therefore its method of doing business was quite irrelevant. Everybody in St. Louis, of course, was well aware of the fact that this association aimed only to serve the dear public!

Some time later the Supreme Court, considering the case against the United States Shoe Machinery Co., came to the interesting class conclusion that control of the market by collusion, exclusion, or occlusion was but a venial sin which was to be whole-heartedly forgiven in view of the technological benefits conferred on society by the company. That outfit which had forced all shoe manufacturers to use their machinery exclusively and to get all repairs and parts from it was a perfect example of monopoly and of monopoly practice. But the court held that the company's browbeating, ruthlessness, and unfair business methods were nothing as compared to its socially-important position as patentee and large-scale producer. (277 U. S. 32.) One can only marvel at the ethical wonders that are accomplished by the courts when they apply their "reason" to Big Capital.

The truth of the matter is that the Supreme Court as an agency of bourgeois dictatorship never intended to apply the anti-trust laws to the trusts. That Court, as well as the other high courts, has acted and continues to act as the vocal instrument of the capitalist class. When the public, that is, the working class, the farmers, and the small business men forced the government to indict the United States Steel Corporation for violations of the Sherman Act, the Supreme Court upheld the right of the corporations to grow to any size, short of absolute monopoly and even to acquire potential power to restrain trade to the limit (251 U. S. 444, 1920). This meant that trusts were given full legal recognition and that henceforth they would not be further annoyed by the Sherman Act.

THE CLAYTON ACT

While the trusts, now legally immune, were growing in size and swindle, becoming the dominant force in the economic and political life of the United States, they used the Supreme Court to wage battle against the working class. That Court knew how to subordinate law to bourgeois "reason."

The first glaring example of this legal Machiavellism was the decision in 1894 holding that the American Railway Union was a trust; that the Pullman Strike conducted by

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

that union was a conspiracy in restraint of interstate commerce; and that Eugene V. Debs was a criminal because he violated an injunction to desist. (*In re Debs*, 158 U. S. 564.) No representative of the trusts had ever been sent to jail for violation of the Sherman Act which provided for imprisonment, but Debs, a representative of the workers, was incarcerated by "the saviors of society." The Court served Mammon well.

The power of the money-bags over the courts was next shockingly seen in the famous Danbury Hatters case of 1908. These Connecticut workers went on strike to protect their jobs. The hat manufacturers obtained an injunction against them from a compliant court and then instituted suit against the union and its membership for treble damages under the Sherman Act. The Mark of the Beast was stamped upon the decision by the Supreme Court. Imposing upon these workers, individually and severally, damages to the extent of every penny they had, the august judges verified poet Goldsmith's statement that: "The laws grind the poor, and the rich rule the laws."

Labor became aroused. Action was demanded of legislators to do away with the loopholes in the Sherman Act which enabled the monopolists to go scot-free and the courts to wreak their capitalist vengeance upon the working class. Trust buster Theodore Roosevelt smiled his most expansive anti-trust smile, but the trusts showed their sharp teeth in the homes, the factories and the courts. Woodrow Wilson came out in 1913 with his "New Freedom," in which he lamented, with petty-bourgeois impotence, the disappearance of free enterprise and the power of the trusts. But it was the agitation by labor that resulted in the passage of the Clayton Act in 1914 which declared that labor organizations or their members cannot be "held or construed to be illegal combinations or conspiracies in restraint of trade, under the anti-trust laws." The theoretical reason given for this exemption of trade unions from the anti-trust laws was: "That the labor of a human being is not a commodity or article of commerce"; hence trade unions are not combinations dealing with goods. This is not the place to discuss political economy which teaches us that labor-power is a commodity which is bought by the capitalists. The point is that the intent of the Act was clear enough. Trade unions could no longer be indicted under the anti-trust laws.

Organized labor was overjoyed after the law had been explained by Samuel Gompers. This worthy hailed the act as "the Magna Charta of labor." (One of the basic characteristics of misleaders of labor is their readiness to greet a law which gives a *little* to labor as a *great* charter of labor.)

The capitalist class appreciated the way Gompers with his resounding rhetoric had succeeded in lulling the vigilance of trade unionists. For they knew what Gompers had failed to explain to the workers, that while "labor is not a commodity," bourgeois judicial office often is.

Following the dictates of the trusts, the Supreme Court in the

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

cases of Duplex Printing Press Co. v. Deering (254 U. S. 443, 1921) and United Mine Workers v. Coronado Coal Co. (1922) cut to pieces the provisions of the Clayton Act which were supposed to give immunity to labor under the anti-trust laws. Taking advantage of legal ambiguities in the Act, the court said in the Duplex case that "the emphasis placed on the words 'lawful,' and 'lawfully,' 'peaceful' and 'peacefully' . . . strongly rebut a legislative intent to confer a general immunity for conduct violative of the anti-trust laws. . . ." This meant that the courts would continue to construe "unlawful" or "unpeaceful" activities of the unions as violations of the Sherman Act and that they alone would decide what was lawful or unlawful. By means of these decisions, the courts killed the hopes of labor that there would be no more repetitions of the Danbury case.

Professor Albion Guilford Taylor in his recent book, *Labor Problems and the Law*, summarizes Clayton's "Magna Charta of labor" as follows: "Despite labor's enthusiasm, perhaps a more futile legislative gesture has never been made, nor have hopes ever been more completely wrecked through judicial interpretation." (p. 527.)

More than hopes were blasted by the interperation of the Clayton Act by the courts: homes and lives of trade unionists also were. The song of Gompers resembled the thud of falling blackjacks on the heads of workers.

The courts had accomplished a mighty work through the sweat of their brow. They proved that labor's exemption from the anti-trust laws meant labor's liability under those laws. They proved that the liability of the trusts under those laws meant their exemption from them. They proved that trusts were not trusts, but instruments of the general welfare. They proved that labor unions are predatory combinations or trusts and their members—magnates who conspired to destroy free competition. Truly, these super-Dogberries knew right from left.

MURPHY AND ARNOLD AS AGENTS OF MONOPOLISTS

Murphy and Arnold now come forth as the mighty gladiators of these reactionary decisions. They announce, to the great joy of the bosses, that their course has been prescribed them by the Supreme Court and that they will follow this course. As to monopolies, like steel, for instance, with its price-fixing, they will do nothing effective. They have already expressed their opposition to anti-profiteering legislation. Murphy, the "progressive," hails the Dies Committee as having "educational value." He scornfully rejects labor's correct assertion that an anti-trust law is not supposed to be an anti-labor law and promises that indictments against trade unions will be as plentiful as mosquitoes on a sultry day. The language of the Department of Justice is becoming even in form the language of America's imperialist magnates.

These evidences of a ruthless offensive by capital against the entire working class were appraised clearly and boldly by Henry Epstein, the New York State Solicitor General:

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

"It would seem—with capital exulting at the wedge being driven deeper and deeper between labor's two great units, with the Wagner Act and its Labor Relations Board assailed before their true worth can be appraised, with war hysteria and witch hunts again on the threshold—that the government has now assailed the organized trade union movement on both flanks." Epstein concludes his remarkable letter with a sharp reminder that reaction is becoming unified against labor, and that both great divisions of labor must act now, for "they have not long to wait."

An indication of the present temper of the courts against labor is revealed in the decision of the United States Circuit Court of Appeals, Dec. 11, which reaffirmed the right of an employer to select employees whom he wants, even though this means discrimination against trade union members. This decision was made in the face of existing legal guarantees for the right of organization.

But the capitalist class is not relying exclusively upon the courts or the Department of Justice for the fulfillment of its desires. Congress, which is today under reactionary control, is preparing a whole series of measures to nullify in effect the Wagner Act. The Smith investigation is but a forerunner in a campaign which bids fair to destroy all the recent achievements of labor—both C.I.O. and A. F. of L. It seems too that the attempt will be made to enact legislation with open anti-union provisions. *The New York Times,* fit organ for the expression of capitalist desires, hailed Arnold's letter and declared:

"It remains to be seen whether Mr. Arnold's interpretation of the anti-trust laws in relation to labor unions will be consistently accepted by the courts. If it is not, then we might well consider whether the anti-trust laws should not be made more explicit along the lines that Mr. Arnold indicates." (Nov. 21, 1939.)

The "we" of the editorial is not "the editorial we" this time. It is the capitalist class speaking to its representatives in Congress.

LABOR MUST RESIST MISUSE OF ANTI-TRUST LAWS

Finance capital is using the government and the courts to give expression to its dictatorship. The arguments between Roosevelt and Wall Street are family affairs which are rapidly being straightened out. The public, of course, is not let in on this secret. The newspapers see to that. Occasionally however the financial pages inform us of that truth which was first so brilliantly discovered by Lenin, namely, that finance capital takes complete possession of the state in the epoch of imperialism. Only the other day, James Grafton Rogers, Professor of Law and Government at Yale, addressed 500 big bankers at the Hotel Astor. In his speech he said: "Banking has ceased to be a private business. The old firm of Banker & Co. has had to take in a new associate. The firm is now Banker, Politician & Co. The politician, at least under his more genteel title of government, must be treated as a continuing and active participant of the firm." (*The New York Times,* Dec.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

5). In plain Marxist English, this means that the bankers decide the scope of the government's job in oppressing the masses.

This raises the question as to what the masses are to do in the face of the present attacks and those that will inevitably come in the near future.

Certainly, the labor movement must combat the application of the Sherman Act against trade unions. It must put up a determined defense of the independence of the trade union movement against the attempts by the Government to institute a series of controls over it. But this fight must be broadened out to include a real struggle against the monopolies which have obtained a stranglehold on the country. The Sherman Act, although futile historically, since it expressed the protest of an era of free competition which saw itself supplanted by the epoch of monopoly or finance capital, was nevertheless progressive in that it also expressed the indignation of the people over monopolist capitalist exploitation. This indignation is growing today. But it must be organized by the trade union movement. The struggle that must be waged against trustified capital is the affair of the entire people.

STOP THE OFFENSIVE OF MONOPOLY

The Communist Party sees the passage of the Sherman Act as a result, not of a romantic harking back to a past, irrevocably gone, but of the class struggle looking toward a future which must inevitably come. It therefore rejects all utopian ideas of "trust-busting," on the one hand, and passivity in the face of the growing power of the trusts, on the other. The objective meaning of the Sherman Act was and remains the struggle against monopoly capital. In that sense it can, through the conscious struggle of the masses, serve as a weapon in the fight against profiteering, in the struggle to prevent the government from awarding juicy contracts to such union-busting citadels of reaction as the Bethlehem Steel, Standard Oil of N. J., and Douglas Aircraft outfits, and in the endeavor to shift the tax burden from the shoulders of the workers and farmers onto the trusts and the owners of these economic institutions.

Lenin and Stalin have shown how the struggle against monopoly capital generates the elements of a revolutionary struggle for socialism. For the oppression of the masses by the trusts, the intensified exploitation of the workers by monopoly capital, and monopoly's fusion with the state apparatus, bring the masses to the realization that only socialism can eliminate the evils inflicted upon them by capitalism.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE OHIO RELIEF CRISIS

BY JOHN WILLIAMSON

AT A gathering of the Ohio Society of New York more than a year ago, the infamous ex-Governor of Ohio, Martin L. Davey, boasted that he had broken the Republic Steel workers' strike and declared his intention of "running the C.I.O. out of Ohio." Recently this assembly of Big Business representatives again foregathered, this time to hear the present Governor, John W. Bricker, declare:

"Ohio is still there. We have not been taken over by the White House or the Department of Interior. . . . We have changed Ohio from a deficit state to a pay-as-you-go state."

It is worth considering just *who* has "taken over" Ohio. The answer of the state administration was given by Governor Bricker himself in his inaugural address, when he stated: "We have today in Ohio a Republican administration determined to help business leaders. . . ." Every move of his administration, from that moment on, has confirmed this. The Bricker legislative program has cut relief, abolished the Unemployment Compensation Board, and refused to extend old-age pensions to thousands of eligibles. It has attempted legislation to incorporate unions, to impose limitations on those eligible to hold office in unions, to exclude "outside" union organizers, to establish a "Little Dies" Committee, and has sought to defeat all labor and progressive legislation. This reactionary program was dictated by the Inter-Organization Committee—lobbying agent for the Chamber of Commerce, the utility interests, *et al.*

Although it is thus clear that Big Business took over the state administration, the workers and their organizations have been more active than ever. The recent municipal elections showed, in the main, a trend opposite to that of 1938. A number of important industrial territories and cities revealed a worker's vote that decisively defeated the reactionary partners of Bricker, Taft and Davey, and elected men who, in their campaign declarations, showed themselves progressives. The Ohio labor movement united to support the Bigelow Pension and Initiative Referendums. In the large Ohio cities the A. F. of L. and C.I.O. were united in their determination to defeat reactionary candidates. Both organizations opposed the relief cuts proposed by the Bricker Administration.

Although Governor Bricker, bidding for Wall Street support of his

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

presidential candidacy, may declare that "Ohio has met all the requirements of government," the people of Ohio know otherwise, and the workers are learning through experience to depend only on their own organized strength and unity rather than on the Republican and Democratic Parties.

Faced by the wrath of the masses, Governor Bricker, Cleveland's Mayor Burton, and the Federal Administration accuse one another of responsibility for the scandalous relief crisis in Ohio cities. The workers, however, are drawing their own conclusion that all three are alike making political capital out of the present situation. For municipal, state and federal authorities are all pleased to describe the existing condition as one in which unemployment in Ohio is being liquidated with the help of the war—a pretext to cut relief and W.P.A., or, as Senator Taft has advocated, to "turn the relief problem back to the localities."

GLARING FACTS ABOUT RELIEF IN OHIO

The Davey Administration was notorious for its inadequate relief. Nevertheless, when Bricker came into office, relief appropriations, which had totalled twenty-eight million dollars in 1938, were cut to only ten million dollars for 1939, with the proviso that, to get any allotment from this state relief fund, the cities must appropriate an equal amount. This meant that, at best, the allowance per person on relief was cut to four cents a meal. In certain cities which had additional appropriations and supplementary federal relief, the top figure was seven cents per person per meal. During this period, the number of people on the home relief rolls actually increased because of W.P.A. layoffs, in spite of the fact that thousands who had no means of subsistence were denied even the scanty aid. The figures for those on relief rolls in Ohio read:

November, 1938	85,000
January, 1939	100,000
March, 1939	96,000
August, 1939	111,000

The recent crisis in Toledo, where relief was cut off completely for more than two months, and in Cleveland, where all single people and childless families were cut off for one month and all other relief recipients had their allowances cut by 50 per cent, can be traced directly to Governor Bricker's slashing of the already inadequate Davey relief appropriations. There we have the meaning of his vaunted "pay-as-you-go state."

The Burton Administration in Cleveland has more or less been publicized in this situation as the "victim" who wanted to take care of the unemployed but whose efforts were blocked by Governor Bricker. While there is political rivalry between Burton and Bricker, and they try to pass the buck to each other for the relief crisis, their attitudes toward the unemployed do not differ. This is clear from an article in the *Cleveland Plain Dealer* for December 17, which stated:

Because of the "large amount of misinformation publicized about the relief crisis here," Burton said in writing to Bricker, the Mayor

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

wishes to take the occasion "to express our deep appreciation for the cooperation between this city and the state . . . in meeting this emergency." Burton further asserted, "There has been no starvation in Cleveland."

Until 1939 Cleveland did not include relief (except W.P.A. sponsorship) in its annual budget, resorting to emergency appropriations when a crisis occurred and when the unemployed demanded action. In 1939 the Burton Administration submitted to the voters its proposal for the highest tax in Cleveland's history; namely, a 7.4 mil levy. This was publicized as "a relief and operating levy," in order to sell it to the people.

But in spite of the great emphasis dishonestly placed on the alleged relief purposes of the levy, actually in the budget based on this all-time high levy only a tiny fraction was allotted to relief, consisting of $600,000 for one month's relief needs, until the Legislature should act, plus an item of $80,000 for relief rents, which had hitherto been paid by the state. The budget contains the following main items:

Operating Expenses	$15,000,000
Interest and Sinking Fund	28,000,000
Relief for One Month	600,000
Relief Rent	800,000

No wonder Mayor Burton received unanimous editorial support from the newspapers! No wonder the *Cleveland News* declared,

"If we had a worse case than this [the increased levy], the *News* would still be for the levy, because we regard Harold H. Burton as a remarkably fine mayor and are willing to take his word."

The results of this "relief policy" of "liberal" Mayor Burton, with its constant cuts and recurring stoppages, are tellingly presented, in sources not connected with the labor or progressive movement. Typical is the statement of Dr. Richard Boltt, Director of the Child Health Association: "Twenty per cent of Cleveland's school children are definitely suffering from malnutrition, and large numbers are on the verge of starvation." This was written last April. One can imagine the condition of these children today.

At this very moment, when Cleveland is facing such a severe crisis, the real Mayor Burton is further revealed by the fact that nearly 10,000 relief clients—certified and awaiting W.P.A. assignments—are prevented from receiving jobs primarily because the city administration refuses to appropriate money for municipal projects.

Out of this dark picture, one important lesson has been learned by the people, namely, that the Burtons, Tafts, Brickers, and other representatives of Big Capital can be forced to retreat in the face of organized struggle. Not only was the relief cut restored and those laid off returned to the relief rolls, but the hitherto "sacred" sinking fund has finally been used, as the Communists have been demanding for years. A $1,200,000 emergency fund was raised through the purchase of tax-delinquency bonds by the city sinking fund. Whenever the Communists raised this possibility before the City Councils or their sub-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

committees, they have always been told, "It can't be done; it's against the law." Now the people see that, as a result of organization and fighting, even such a sacred cow as the bankers' sinking fund can be touched—if only temporarily.

To appreciate this Ohio relief crisis, one must not overlook the responsibility of Congress and the Roosevelt Administration itself. Senator Taft cast the deciding vote on the bill which cut the W.P.A. rolls the first time; but President Roosevelt paved the road for these W.P.A. cuts by his failure to request an adequate W.P.A. appropriation. Since then, his W.P.A. Administrator has repeatedly declared that he will make no request for a deficiency appropriation. The drastic effects upon W.P.A. employment in Ohio can be seen from the following figures:

OHIO W.P.A. EMPLOYMENT

October, 1938	280,000
March, 1939	242,547
April, 1939	225,920
November, 1939	130,000

The present relief crisis in Ohio is the result of the policy of American capitalism—now reunited to further its own imperialist war policy—which launches, at the outset, attacks on the workers' conditions, their legislative achievements, their civil liberties, and their organizations. The responsibility for the starvation and misery of thousands of Ohio citizens—not to speak of the health and stamina of the state's future adults—lies directly at the doorstep of city, state and federal governments which are carrying out in unison the dictates of the economic royalists.

Whatever temporary relief has been won is a direct result of the developing mass actions of the workers, led by the trade unions and the Workers Alliance, with the active participation of the Communists.

A TRIAL ASSAULT ON THE LABOR MOVEMENT

While the American bourgeoisie chose Ohio, the state of Taft and Bricker, to test their plan for wiping out relief altogether, the "liberal" Burton Administration has been exposed as actively working to advance another phase of the war policies of the bourgeoisie: its attacks on the trade unions.

The Cleveland C.I.O. Council has recently released to the newspapers the partial results of its investigation into a huge plot, participated in by the employers, the Associated Industries, the Federal Bureau of Investigation, and the Burton Administration. This plan, allegedly a defense against "sabotage," has all the earmarks of a new streamlined plot against the trade unions. It is best described in a letter that appeared in the *Cleveland Press* for December 16 from Mr. A. E. Stevenson, secretary of the Cleveland C.I.O.:

"On December 9, E. O. Fehlhaber and myself visited the office of the U.S. Attorney General and the office of the F.B.I. in Washington.* We were shown a letter from J. Edgar Hoover to Attorney-General Mur-

* They went to protest against the anti-labor plot which Ness, Burton's Safety Director, had denied.—*J. W.*

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

phy, in which the Cleveland labor espionage plan was carefully described. Mr. Ness was credited with playing an instrumental part in setting up this organization known as the Cleveland Industrial Safety Council. Under this plan, each employer is assessed twenty-five cents per quarter for each employee, and the money is used to hire undercover agents to destroy the union movement. . . . Mr. Ness has set up a special squad in the Police Department to coordinate this activity. . . . Telephones have been tapped, mail has been stolen from homes, and private detectives have been harassing union members and their wives."

According to a Washington dispatch in the *Daily Worker* on December 23, 1939, President Roosevelt—fresh from lending millions to Finland and scuttling the Wagner Health Bill—announced "he was in accord with the manner in which the situation is being handled in Cleveland." He deemed it "necessary for industrialists and local officials to cooperate with the Federal Government in ferreting out 'saboteurs,'" and hastily added "that labor too should cooperate."

From these and other such revelations, it is clear either that Cleveland is an experimental ground for similar attacks against the trade union movement elsewhere or that similar plans are under way in every large industrial city. This expose shows the imminent danger to every trade union. It shows the close working unity of local Republican administrations with the national Roosevelt Administration in furthering such attacks against the labor movement. These plans are part of the active war schemes and policies of the Washington Administration to promote the imperialist interests of Wall Street. They must be met at once by the trade unions and all other progressive organizations, with united forces. The unions and their leadership must understand clearly the connection between such planned attacks on them and the present war policy of American capitalism, which the Roosevelt Administration is furthering. Without such clarity, no real progress can be made in defeating and abolishing this threat to all civil liberties, democratic rights, and the very existence of trade unionism itself.

The relief situation, the attacks on unions, the vicious fight against the Bigelow Old-Age Pension referendum are all signs of a new onslaught by American capitalism against the workers and their organizations, of which the drive against the Communists is but one phase.

OHIO WORKERS RESIST THIS ATTACK

The people of Ohio, especially the workers, have indicated in a number of ways their determination to fight reaction. This is seen from the following instances:

1. The progressive candidates in the Mahoning Valley, Massillon, the City Council of Akron, and in some cities of the Ohio Valley, achieved an overwhelming victory in the November elections.

2. A substantial vote was given to the Communist candidates in a number of cities, especially in Akron and Youngstown, where that vote reached new high levels. Espe-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

cially important in this connection was the vote received by Comrade A. R. Onda in Ward 30 in Cleveland. Although Comrade Onda lost the nomination to the run-off election by 195 votes, the vote cast for him was higher than the run-off vote in the last municipal election. This means that despite the confusion, Red-baiting and its divisive consequences—Comrade Onda retained his vote of two years ago, which indicates (under these circumstances) a vote of higher quality. Ward 30 showed on a small scale the splitting role of the Social-Democrats and the Roosevelt Democrats since the latter's desertion of the New Deal. The Czech Social-Democrats placed in nomination against Comrade Onda a candidate who polled 500 votes, thus directly bringing about nomination of a candidate running on a Red-baiting program. Among the Jewish people, a Roosevelt candidate who resorted to slander and Red-baiting in connection with the international situation and who, therefore, had the open support of the Jewish Social-Democrats and the Trotskyites, played the same splitting role.

3. The half million votes cast in support of the Bigelow Pension Plan, despite the unprecedented campaign against it by every force at the command of Big Business, shows it to be a vital issue of the people. The outlook of Big Business was expressed by Senator Taft, who called for "a crushing defeat of both Bigelow amendments . . . so that these issues shall never rise again."

4. There is growing clarity as to the imperialist character of the present war, as evidenced by the keynote speech of Mr. John Owens, President of the C.I.O. State Council, in which he declared:

"We want to resolve as parents, citizens and producers that no American life will be sacrificed to preserve some ideology predicated on preserving the resources of the wealthy in other parts of the world. We might as well serve notice now that if our wage standards will only purchase 50 per cent of our necessities, we will not stand for artificial purchasing power. We will demand higher wages."

Today, the workers and their organizations must take the lead in combatting these attacks of reaction on every front. This means intensifying the struggle for adequate relief and against W.P.A. cuts; it means working to reconstitute the pension movement with a strong trade union base; it means developing a mighty civil rights movement to smash the plans directed against the unions and all attacks on civil rights; it means fighting for higher wages to meet the increased cost of living; it means initiating effective unionizing drives in the unorganized industries. Such struggles and mass movements of necessity must connect their immediate objectives with the central objective of keeping America out of the imperialist war.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE "HISTORY OF THE C.P.S.U.(B.)" AND THE PROPAGATION OF MARXISM-LENINISM IN THE WORLD COMMUNIST MOVEMENT

RESOLUTION ADOPTED AUG. 10, 1939

1. THE IMPORTANCE OF THE "HISTORY OF THE C.P.S.U.(B.)" FOR THE COMMUNIST WORLD MOVEMENT, THE INTERNATIONAL PROLETARIAT AND THE WORKING PEOPLE OF ALL COUNTRIES

THE appearance of the *History of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union (Bolsheviks)* is one of the greatest events in the life of the Communist world movement and of the international labor movement, in the struggle of the working people of all countries for emancipation. Written with the immediate participation of Comrade Stalin and authorized by the Central Committee of the C.P.S.U.(B.), the *History* occupies an extraordinary place among the classic works of Marxism-Leninism. The *History* is intended to play—and will undoubtedly play—a very important role in the successful mastering of Bolshevism by the Communists of the capitalist countries, in the consolidation of the Sections of the Communist International, and in raising their ideological and political level.

The special importance of the *History of the C.P.S.U.(B.)* for the working people of the capitalist countries consists in the following:

The *History* shows them the way to create and consolidate the party of a new type, the Party of Lenin and Stalin, which is the model for all other Communist Parties.

In the *History,* the close interaction of revolutionary theory and revolutionary practice is shown from the experience of the long years of struggle conducted by Lenin and Stalin on the political, economic and theoretical field against the bourgeoisie, the landowners, against imperialism and against all agents of the class enemy within the labor movement and also inside the Party.

The *History* shows the path of struggle traveled by the Bolshevik Party in solving the general democratic tasks, in transforming the bourgeois-democratic revolution into the socialist revolution; it shows the path of revolutionary overthrow of the power of the bourgeoisie and the landowners and the establishment of the dictatorship of the proletariat.

The *History* gives the exceedingly rich experience of the first victori-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ous, great socialist revolution in the world, which has opened a new epoch in the history of humanity; it conveys the experience of three revolutions, in the fire of which Lenin and Stalin forged and tempered the invincible party of the Bolsheviks.

It conveys the theory and practice of the building of socialist society, the theory and practice of the world-historic victory of socialism in the U.S.S.R.

The *History of the C.P.S.U.(B.)* educates Communists in the spirit of staunch fidelity to principle, Bolshevist irreconcilableness and vigilance toward the class enemies. It equips the Communist Parties for the fight against deviations from the Bolshevist line, for the fight against the influence of the Social-Democratic spirit and other ideological tendencies alien to the working class; it is an invaluable weapon in the fight against the Trotskyite agents of fascism, against the Right renegades, against all these diversionists, spies and murderers, these worst enemies of the working people.

The *History* shows Bolshevist strategy and tactics in action, gives examples of the offensive and organized retreat under the concrete conditions of the class struggle.

It teaches Communists soberly to estimate the relation of class forces at every stage of struggle; it teaches them the necessity of rightly estimating the forces of the class enemy and thereby securing the greatest success for the revolutionary movement of the proletariat. It rouses in them revolutionary enthusiasm, teaches them to take the fortress of the enemy in a Bolshevist manner, to be stubborn and persistent in overcoming difficulties.

It teaches how the struggle must be conducted for the unity of the working class, for the rallying together of its allies—the peasantry, the middle class, the oppressed nations—under the leadership of the proletariat headed by the Communist Party.

By its masterly exposition of the history of the C.P.S.U.(B.) and the revolutionary movement in Russia, the *History* represents for the Communists in other countries a living example of how the dialectical method must be correctly applied to the study of the history of their parties and the labor movement of their countries, how the tasks confronting the working class of their own countries must be correctly put and solved.

The *History of the C.P.S.U.(B.)* is a definite proof of how invincible is the party of the working class, if it is guided by the theory of Marxism-Leninism. The *History* opens clear perspectives, and strengthens the confidence of the international working class in the ultimate victory of communism throughout the whole world.

The *History* is a model example of creative Marxism in contrast to the dogmatism, castration and distortion of Marxism by the Second International. The *History,* which reflects the tremendous creative wealth which Lenin and Stalin contributed to the theory of Marxism, becomes the starting point for a fresh upsurge of theoretical Marxist ideology in the whole world, widens the political horizon of the

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

whole emancipation movement of the toilers, and facilitates and accelerates the triumph of the working class. The *History* is a short scientific encyclopedia containing the fundamental theories of Marxist-Leninist science.

The *History of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union (B.)* is the common property of the Communists, the labor movement, the toilers of all countries. It is the history of the Bolshevik Party of that country which has become the birthplace of Leninism, the fatherland of the Leninist-Stalinist theory of the socialist revolution, the country of the victorious dictatorship of the proletariat, the country of socialism, the fatherland of the toilers of all countries.

Therefore, the Communists will never forget that the U.S.S.R. represents the living embodiment of the ultimate aims of the international labor movement and the bearer of the uniform international task of the world proletariat; that the experience of the years of struggle of the C.P.S.U.(B.) is of decisive importance for the toilers of all countries. At the same time, the Communists of the capitalist countries must never overlook the fact that they have to fight under other historical concrete conditions than those obtaining in tsarist Russia; that Social-Democratic ideology is more deeply rooted in their labor movements than was the case in the Russian labor movement; that the bourgeoisie has during the last decades acquired much experience in the struggle against the revolutionary movement; that the relative weight of the working class in their countries is different from that in the country of victorious socialism; that the level of class-consciousness and the degree of organization of the toilers in the capitalist countries lags far behind the degree of consciousness and organization of the toilers in the Soviet Union.

Above all, the Communists in the capitalist countries must bear in mind that the working class in the U.S.S.R. is a victorious class, while they have still to fight in their countries for their victory. For all these reasons, the Communists in the capitalist countries must not blindly follow the experiences of the C.P.S.U.(B.) when solving their concrete political, tactical and organizational tasks, must not apply these experiences mechanically to the conditions of their countries and their labor movements. While utilizing the invaluable experiences of the C.P.S.U.(B.), they must carefully and thoroughly study the specific conditions of their country and every concrete situation, and in adopting their decisions take into consideration these conditions and this concrete situation.

The Communists must always remember Lenin's and Stalin's instructions that one must know how to apply the experiences of the C.P.S.U.(B.) to the new historical conditions of the struggle of the working class. The Communist Parties must always bear in mind that "some fundamental features of our revolution have no local, no specific national, exclusively Russian, but international importance" (Lenin), but the Communists of every country must "investigate, study, find out, judge and understand the spe-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

cifically national feature in the concrete methods of every country in solving the uniform international task." (Lenin.) This is the more necessary as the paths to the attainment of the proletarian dictatorship, Soviet power, may be different in the various capitalist countries.

The *History of the C.P.S.U.(B.)* teaches the international proletariat how the struggle for the fulfillment of the fundamental task, to defeat capitalism, can be successfully combined with the defense of the daily interests of the toilers and the fulfillment of the daily tasks confronting the proletariat in the various stages of its struggle. By the study and thoroughgoing exposition of the *History of the C.P.S.U.(B.)* the Communist Parties obtain a powerful weapon for the struggle against fascism and the fascist warmongers, for the setting up and consolidation of the workers' united front and people's front, for the establishment of the united international front of the nations against the aggressors: they obtain a weapon enabling them to rally the millions of toilers round the great country of socialism.

The study of the *History of the C.P.S.U.(B.)* and the mastery of Marxism are a guarantee that under the difficult conditions of the present international situation the policy laid down on the basis of the teachings of Lenin and Stalin by the Seventh Congress of the Communist International will be successfully and consistently carried out, and before all the split in the ranks of the international labor movement overcome.

By their improved mastery of the theory of Marxism-Leninism the Communists can, in applying the tactics of the united front, avoid both its Right-opportunist distortion and lapses into sectarianism. They are able to isolate and defeat the capitulators and other enemies in the labor movement and overcome the difficulties in the way of rallying the toilers under the leadership of the working class.

"But theory can become the greatest force in the labor movement if it is built up in indissoluble connection with revolutionary practice, for it, and it alone, can give to the movement confidence, the power of orientation and an understanding of the inner connection between events; for it, and it alone, can help us in our practical work to discern how and in which direction classes are moving not only at the present time, but also how and in which direction they will move in the near future." *

2. ON THE DISTRIBUTION OF THE "HISTORY OF THE C.P.S.U. (B.)"

The History of the C.P.S.U.(B.) meets a long-felt want of the people, and in the first place of the Communists, who want to study Marxism-Leninism. Not a single Marxist-Leninist book has up to now met with such a great response from the workers and reached such sale fingures in such a short time as the *History*. In France, in the United States, and in some other capitalist countries the sale of the *History* represents an indubitable success. But these are only the first steps. It would therefore be dangerous to be satisfied with what has been achieved hitherto, the more so

* Joseph Stalin, *Leninism*, Vol. I, p. 27. International Publishers, New York.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

as in many countries (in particular in the countries of the fascist dictatorship) the distribution of the *History* has hardly begun yet.

It would be a mistake to compare the distribution of the *History* with that of other earlier published books. In their sales campaigns for the *History* the Communist Parties must bear in mind that behind each member of the Communist Party (as can be seen by the votes cast for the Communist Party candidates at elections in the countries with a legal Communist movement) there stand ten to fifteen sympathizers who are ready to support the Party. It is necessary to make the appearance of the *History* the turning point in the sale of Marxist-Leninist literature, the powerful lever, in order to spread the ideas of Marxism-Leninism among the broad masses.

In order to secure a broad and correct distribution of the book it is necessary to adopt the following measures:

(a) To see that every member of the Party gets a copy of the *History*, studies it and makes it his or her textbook;

(b) To employ every method to distribute the *History* among the Social-Democratic workers and cadres of the Social-Democratic parties;

(c) To devote particular attention to the distribution of the book among the members, and in particular the officials, of the trade unions, the mass labor organizations and the democratic organizations (cooperatives, cultural organizations, etc.); to see to it that the libraries of these organizations are supplied with the *History;*

(d) To organize the sale of the book among the progressive intelligentsia, including the progressive section of the students;

(e) To devote greatest attention to the distribution of the *History* among the youth, to overcome the inadmissible lagging behind in this sphere (even in France where up to now the distribution of the work has been successfully conducted); the young Communists must become the champions for the distribution of the *History.*

(f) To organize the distribution of the book also among the progressive elements of the peasantry, and thereby to put an end to the prejudice of some Communists that "the peasants are unable to read and study a serious Marxist book."

(g) For the distribution of the *History* in the countries of fascist dictatorship and in the colonies where the work of the Communist Parties is encountering great difficulties, it is necessary that the legal Communist Parties (Communist Parties of France, United States, Great Britain, Holland and other countries) assist the illegal and weaker Communist Parties.

(h) The guidance of the distributive work of the *History* must by no means be left entirely in the hands of the publishers. It must be in the hands of the Central Committee of the Party. All Party organizations, propagandists and agitators, as well as those persons who sympathize with the Party, must be drawn into the work of distribution. It is advisable to publish in the press comments of readers, Commu-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

nists, non-Party people, trade union officials, prominent members of the progressive intelligentsia, etc., on the book. The reporting on the distribution must be made in an exact manner (as is being done in France). It is necessary to ascertain in every locality how this work in being carried on, whereby inadequate and wrong methods must be corrected. The achieved results are to be published in the press and reported at meetings and conferences, as is being done in France and in the United States in order to stimulate the increased sale of the *History*.

It is particularly important in the countries with a legal labor movement to maintain a permanent contact with the purchasers of the book, to assist them in the study and to try to make them active propagandists and canvassers for the *History*.

3. ON THE ORGANIZATION OF THE STUDY OF "THE HISTORY OF THE C.P.S.U. (B.)"

But it does not by far suffice to secure the widest distribution of the *History*; in addition the study of the book must be organized in a satisfactory manner. At present there is still to be observed a disparity between the work of distribution of the *History* and the organization of its study. This disparity must be overcome in the shortest possible time, for otherwise the successes in the distribution will only be formal successes and the main aim, to raise the level of the Marxist-Leninist theoretical training of the Party members, will not be achieved. On the other hand, this disparity may become a serious obstacle in the further distribution of the book.

The organizing of the study of the *History* must not bear the character of a temporary campaign. A systematic activity must be initiated which should in every way arouse among the Communists and the toilers the desire to study more of the Marxist-Leninist theory.

In organizing the study of the *History* attention must be directed that in the first place the Party cadres, the Communist officials, the officials of the Young Communist League, of the trade unions and other mass organizations study the book. It must be considered as an axiom in the Party that only those members can be real Bolsheviks who study the "Short Course" and indefatigably work to raise their level of theoretical knowledge.

At the same time it is necessary that the leadership of the Party adopt every measure in order to draw also sympathizers, Social-Democratic workers, trade union officials who are not Communists, and others into the study of the *History*.

In considering the peculiarities of the various capitalist countries it would be advisable to take into account the following suggestions as guiding lines for the study of the *History*.

I. IN COUNTRIES WITH A LEGAL COMMUNIST MOVEMENT

(a) The study of the *History* should be organized according to groups, and care must be taken to bring in all Party members. A great political educational task must be accomplished, and all necessary or-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ganizational measures must be carried out so that the Party members really participate in the study of the *History* and do not restrict themselves to formal resolutions of the leadership to the effect that participation of Communists in the study is necessary.

(b) For the responsible functionaries who are politically more educated, for the leading cadres of the Party, it is considered necessary to organize in the main centers of the countries some special circles of a higher type at which the source material, and primarily the works quoted in the *History* are used for study.

(c) Side by side with the study of the *History* in the groups and circles, independent study of the *History of the C.P.S.U.(B.)* must throughout be organized and furthered, particularly among the more politically educated cadres of the Party.

(d) For the propaganda of the *History* and of the theory of Marxism-Leninism among the non-Party elements and among the membership of anti-fascist parties and organizations, lectures, readings and discussions should be organized within these organizations, with particular reference to theoretical questions which have an immediate importance.

It is necessary that the most highly educated Communists, politically and theoretically, should, under the direction of the Party organizations, form circles in factories and working class districts for the study of the *History* among the non-Party workers, particularly Social-Democrats.

II. IN COUNTRIES WHERE THE COMMUNIST MOVEMENT IS ILLEGAL

The correct organization of the study of the *History* is, in the countries under fascist dictatorship, the most important means for the creation of a strong illegal Communist Party, capable, in spite of the raging terror, of carrying on systematic mass work and of organizing and leading the struggle of the working class and of the toilers for the overthrow of the fascist power. The study of the *History* must become an effective factor in the establishment of new lower Party organizations, in the recruitment of new members, and in the building up and strengthening of the illegal Communist Parties. In these countries, it is necessary to apply the most various and elastic forms of study of the *History*.

III. THE ORGANIZATION OF ASSISTANCE FOR THOSE WHO ARE STUDYING THE "HISTORY"

To all those who are studying the *History* all-around assistance must be assured, for which reason the carrying out of the following measures is considered necessary:

(a) The periodical press must be thoroughly utilized in order systematically and radically to explain questions of Marxist-Leninist theory and particularly those questions in the *History* which have a particularly contemporary importance, as, for instance, the following questions: just and unjust wars and pacifism; the relation of the Bolsheviks to bourgeois democracy; the unity of the working class; the middle classes and the Leninist-Stalinist theory of the socialist revolution; and so on. The press should publish

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

advice and replies to questions of readers who are studying the *History*.

(b) Public lectures, as well as oral and written advice, should be organized, and in this connection, wherever possible, the radio and cinema should be utilized.

(c) The Party reviews are to be modified in the direction that they chiefly become a means of aiding in the study of the *History*, that they arouse the interest of the Party in theoretical questions, that, by means of arguments, they provide a soundly-based, profound foundation for the tactical position of the Communists, that they develop an earnest struggle on behalf of the purity of Marxist-Leninist theory, of the triumph of militant Marxism in the labor movement, and of the sharpening of theoretical vigilance with regard to all enemies and distorters of Marxism.

IV. THE STUDY OF THE "HISTORY" IN THE PARTY SCHOOLS

For the more rapid and more basic education of strong Marxist-Leninist cadres, it is necessary to extend the network of schools, to transform their curriculum, and critically to examine all literature used by the schools, in accordance with the viewpoints given in the *History*.

The most important measures with regard to the schools are as follows:

(a) To introduce in the central Party schools a course, "Foundations of Marxism-Leninism," as the sole course for the study of the science of Marxism-Leninism. The *History* and Comrade Stalin's *Leninism* to be used as the basis of this study program. The course on "History of the Working Class" of the particular country in question is to be maintained as an independent course in the school's program, and must be most closely related to the *History of the C.P.S.U.(B.)* and to *Leninism*.

(b) Wherever conditions of legality permit, care should be taken to establish evening courses for the study of the *History* to the widest possible extent throughout the lower and middle cadres of the Party.

(c) In the short-term schools the chief effort should be directed towards enabling those Party cadres who have been through the school to continue independently a more thorough study of the *History* and of the other works of Marxism-Leninism.

4. THE PROPAGATION OF MARXISM-LENINISM MUST BE BROUGHT TO A HIGHER LEVEL

The victory of socialism in the U.S.S.R., which was prepared and theoretically based and generalized through the work of Lenin and Stalin, has played an important part in the diffusion of Marxist-Leninist ideas throughout the whole world. The establishment of the Communist Parties, and their self-sacrificing struggle throughout twenty years for the cause of Communism, have also contributed towards this. Nevertheless, all the Communist Parties, although they have increased their influence over the masses and have grown organizationally, are very backward in the field of the mastery of Marxist-Leninist theory. Particularly is the

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

lack of cadres educated in Marxism felt in the colonial and dependent countries (India, Latin America, and so on).

This backwardness in the mastery of theory restricts the further development of the Communist Parties, limits their capacity for finding their way independently amidst the difficult conditions of the class struggle, and leads to the committing of serious political errors by Party cadres which are inadequately equipped with theory. Nowadays the question of the necessity of raising the knowledge of Marxism-Leninism to a higher level is a more pressing one than ever for the Communist Parties.

Above all, the Communist Parties must take into consideration the important increase in their membership since the Seventh Congress of the Communist International. In the larger legal, and even in many illegal, Communist Parties the overwhelming majority of the membership consists of comrades who have entered the Party during the last three or four years, and who therefore have no serious Marxist-Leninist training.

Furthermore, there is a number of other considerations which dictate to the Communist Parties the necessity of making the propagation of Marxism-Leninism one of the most important fighting tasks of the day.

First, we must not ignore the frenzied campaign against Marxism of the fascists who in the fascist countries have established the whole vast state apparatus for the struggle against Marxism and for the propagation of the ridiculous "theories" of fascism.

Second, one must continually bear in mind that in the capitalist countries the labor movement is exposed to the influence of bourgeois ideology and to the most varying non-Marxist ideological tendencies (in France, those of Jaures' conceptions and of syndicalism; in Great Britain, those of trade unionism and of Fabianism; in Spain, of Anarchism; in Poland, of bourgeois nationalism; and so on); the Communist Parties are not carrying on any thoroughgoing struggle against these conceptions.

Third, it must be borne in mind that the most reactionary capitulationist leaders of Social-Democracy (Spaak, de Man, Stampfer, Paul Faure, and others), who continually pass on to ever more openly fascist positions, and who, like the fascists, conceal this betrayal under a campaign against Marxism, are endeavoring to undermine the faith of the working class in the invincible power of scientific socialism and thus to frustrate the struggle of the toilers against fascism.

Fourth, we should not underestimate the despicable undermining work of the Trotskyite agents of fascism who concoct the most contemptible and poisonous calumnies on the work of socialism in the U.S.S.R. and the theory of Marx, Engels, Lenin and Stalin.

This highly concentrated campaign of all hidden and open enemies of the toilers against Marxism aims at one objective: politically to disarm the working class and to strengthen the position of the fas-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

cist bourgeoisie. As Comrade Stalin said at the Eighteenth Congress of the C.P.S.U.:

"The chief endeavor of the bourgeoisie of all countries and of its reformist hangers-on is to kill in the working class faith in its own strength, faith in the possibility and inevitability of its victory, and thus to perpetuate capitalist slavery."*

For this reason the task of the Communist Parties consists in thwarting the plans of these enemies by fighting for and propagating the theory of Marxism-Leninism to strengthen the faith of the working class in its own force and thus to facilitate and accelerate its victory.

The starting point in the realization of the necessary transformation in the mastery of Marxist-Leninist theory, in the establishment of propagandist work in the sections of the Communist International and of a broad Marxist-Leninist mass instruction, must be the distribution and study of the *History of the C.P.S.U.(B.)*, together with a profound study of the original works of Marx, Engels, Lenin and Stalin.

It is impossible to raise the educational work in the Sections of the Communist International to the level of the decisive task of the Communist movement without assuring to this all-important phase of Party activity the firm, well-considered, constant leadership by the Central Committees. At present, this leadership is in most cases exerted with particular weakness. In many Communist Parties there exists a political cleavage between the political leadership and the educational work. The educational work is frequently looked upon as a matter of secondary importance, and as the narrow specialty of certain comrades who stand apart from the leadership and from the political activity of the Party. In many Parties there is a failure to study the experiences gained in educational work and to organize the exchange of such experiences.

The teaching of Marxism-Leninism must be radically transformed.

The most important measures for the transformation of the teaching of Marxism-Leninism must be as follows:

(a) The development of numerous cadres of teachers who are capable of instructing both through the spoken and written word. In consideration of the particular neglect of this work, it is necessary in the illegal Parties to undertake the development of teachers' cadres both in emigration and in the country itself, for which purpose the most highly trained comrades should be employed and particularly those who, because of considerations of secret work, cannot be entrusted with other work.

A situation must be brought about in which every Party functionary without exception not only himself studies the *History of the C.P.S.U.(B.)* and works to raise the level of his theoretical knowledge, but also that he undertakes alongside his general Party work a specific task of teaching.

(b) In the big legal Parties, the Central Committees must form a group of qualified professional edu-

* Joseph Stalin, *From Socialism to Communism in the Soviet Union*, p. 62. International Publishers, New York.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

cators who are capable of ensuring a high type of educational work (lectures, consultations, the control of educational work in the localities, and assistance for local Party organizations in the setting up of educational work).

(c) At the sessions of the leading Party organs, right up to the Political Bureau and the Plenum of the Central Committee, regular reports on the progress of educational work are to be heard and the necessary measures for the improvement of this work are to be adopted, as well as the organization of control over the execution of these measures.

(d) Regular discussion must take place between the instructors, the editors of the Party newspapers and reviews, the teachers in the Party schools, and so on, and representatives of the Party leadership, so as to study the experiences acquired in the course of educational work, to elucidate immediate theoretical questions, and systematically to keep the instructors informed by the Party leadership of immediate questions of home and foreign politics.

(e) It is considered necessary to organize, in countries with a legal Communist movement, periodical "theoretical conferences," in order to discuss the most immediate and important questions which rise to the surface in the course of study. These conferences must be carried out under the direction of the corresponding Party committee (district, city or sub-district), and in them will take part both the instructors as well as those who are engaged in the study of Marxism-Leninism in the groups or circles, or who are studying independently.

(f) In consideration of the low level of theoretical training of the Young Communist Leagues and of the urgent task of organizing the Marxist-Leninist training of the Communist youth, the Communist Party must provide effective aid in this respect, particularly by placing at the disposal of the Young Communist League strong teaching cadres of the Party in order to organize the study of Marxism-Leninism in the Young Communist League.

(g) The work of the publishing houses is to be so organized that, besides the contemporary agitational literature, they not only publish the works of Marx, Engels, Lenin and Stalin, but also strive to achieve for them the very widest distribution.

The real direction of the publishing houses by the Central Committees is to be achieved by the following means: the selection of qualified and tested cadres; the help of the Central Committee in the drawing up of the annual publishing plan; control over the fulfilment of the plans; supervision of the sales of literature; and the rendering of reports periodically on the progress of publishing work, the distribution of literature, and so on, at the sessions of the Secretariat and of the Political Bureau.

On the basis of these theses, it is necessary that every Communist Party be given suitable directives with regard to the circulation and study of the *History* and the transformation of the entire work of the study of Marxism-Leninism. Wher-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ever circumstances of legality permit, the Party leadership must carry out discussions with the instructors, so as to discuss beforehand with them the transformation of the work of teaching of Marxism-Leninism, and related questions; it is also necessary in all Party groups to study these theses, as well as the directives of the Central Committees on the same question.

The most important criterion of the Bolshevik maturity of the Communist Parties and their Central Committees will be as to how they fulfil the task of the mass distribution and organization of the study of the *History,* the task of correctly estimating the teaching of Marxism-Leninism, the task of mastering the most advanced theory of the working-class movement.

The history of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union teaches us that:

"Only a party which has mastered the Marxist-Leninist theory can confidently advance and lead the working class forward."*

Only such a Party will be capable of defending the interests of the proletariat and of the toiling masses, of fusing the forces of the anti-fascist front, of repelling fascism and the fascist incendiaries and of bringing about the overthrow of the hated fascist dictatorship. Only such a Party will be capable of leading the working class in the attack upon capitalism, of standing at the head of the struggle of the toilers for their liberation from capitalist slavery, and leading them, through the achievement and consolidation of the dictatorship of the proletariat, to the gleaming summits of the Communist society.

SIGNED BY THE COMMUNIST PARTIES OF FRANCE, GREAT BRITAIN, THE U.S.A., GERMANY AND ITALY.

---

* *History of the C.P.S.U.(B.)*, p. 355. International Publishers, New York.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

BOOK REVIEWS

WILLIAM GREEN RECONSTRUCTS LABOR HISTORY

LABOR AND DEMOCRACY, by William Green. Princeton University Press, 194 pages.

IN HIS new book, *Labor and Democracy,* William Green appears to have in mind two main objectives. The first is an appeal to employers to support the A. F. of L. as a solid bulwark against Communism and militant unionism. The second is to prove to labor that, within the range of its anti-radicalism and with a weather eye upon the C.I.O., the A. F. of L., or rather its leadership, is a progressive force in advancing the interests of the workers. Mr. Green's argument literally butchers American trade union history.

To support his first proposition, Mr. Green rehashes the typical A. F. of L. bureaucrats' pro-capitalistic arguments. It does not occur to him to examine the basic foundations of the capitalist system, the private ownership of industry and land and the exploitation of the toilers for profit. Green simply takes capitalism for granted, as something that is here as naturally and irrevocably as the land, sea, sky and other natural phenomena. The world may be prostrated with industrial chaos; wars may rage in Europe and the Far East; reaction may threaten the existence of civilization; but Green, like other pro-capitalist writers, sees nothing in all this indicating the decay of the capitalist system. He glibly passes over the crisis of capitalism in decay as due to superficial causes which can readily be remedied under the present system by "forward-looking" people.

The nearest Green comes toward indicating that perhaps something may be wrong with capitalism itself is in the statement "when private enterprise cannot adjust itself to new conditions, it fails to serve the public need, places public welfare in jeopardy and becomes a deterrent force. It is then that the government must respond, assuming such measure of regulation in industry and in private enterprise as will bring the economic processes to the point where society is adequately served and protected" (p. 148). But Green carefully refrains from implementing this vague generality with proposals to restrict the sphere of private enterprise. He does not go as far as New Dealers generally have done in proposing restrictive regulations; much less does he make any proposals for municipal or government ownership, even of the mildest milk-and-water variety.

As one reads Mr. Green's shallow analysis and empty remedies for what ails present-day society and sees him thereby expose his com-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

plete unawareness of the economic and class forces now in conflict on a world scale, one realizes afresh the grave unfitness of the top leaders of the A. F. of L. and how they obstruct the forward march of labor.

To establish the second general proposition of his book, that the A. F. of L. leadership is progressive, Green obviously has an impossible task on his hands. Every honest student of American labor history knows that the A. F. of L. bureaucracy, intent on its own narrow interests as a labor officialdom, has long been a stumbling block in the way of the workers' advance. Every progressive movement finds this labor officialdom in stubborn opposition. The modest progress that has been made recently in the A. F. of L.'s legislative program has been produced by rank-and-file pressure against the reactionary top leadership. Hence, Mr. Green, in his unachievable job of painting the A. F. of L. high command as progressive, has to resort to gross distortions of trade union experience. This invalidates his book as a contribution to the study of the history of American labor.

Of Green's many distortions, characteristic is the way he misrepresents the historical role of the Left wing of the labor movement. Lumping together the I.W.W., the Socialist Party (in its early years), and the Communist Party, he declares that they have exploited the workers' difficulties "in order to overthrow our present system of government, and establish a socialist state." One, of course, cannot expect the employer-minded Green to appreciate the revolutionary educational work of the Left wing; but when he attempts to deny its long and loyal defense of the workers' immediate economic and political interests and its support to every progressive reform in the labor movement, this can only be classed as deliberate falsification of labor's history. Green crows that the A. F. of L. leadership defeated the I.W.W. and the Socialist Party (in its militant days), and he believes—a futile hope—that it has also licked the Communists.

Another gross distortion is Green's treatment of the attitude of the A. F. of L. to progressive labor legislation. He tries to portray the A. F. of L. leadership as champion of such measures as unemployment insurance and wages-and-hours laws. But the reality sticks out in trade union history like a sore thumb, that the old-line A. F. of L. leaders bitterly opposed such legislation as dangerously infringing upon the "natural functions" of the trade unions. Even as late as the Boston A. F. of L. convention of 1931, when 15,000,000 workers were unemployed, Green and his fellow leaders, in tune with the reactionary Hoover, were denouncing unemployment insurance as a deadly menace to the labor movement. It was mass pressure, largely organized by the Communist Party, that eventually forced the A. F. of L. leadership to retreat from this outrageous position.

These leaders set up similar opposition to the wages-and-hours law and to various other legislative proposals in behalf of labor until they were forced to retreat. To

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

clean the unsavory A. F. of L. record on these questions, Green puts much blame on Sam Gompers, while himself he portrays as a tireless advocate of social legislation who opposed Gompers on this issue. This is news to those of us who spent many years in the Federation trying to induce it to adopt a progressive policy toward social legislation. Characteristically playing down the Left-wing role, Green personally takes great credit (page 53) because he voted in 1914 for a proposed national eight-hour law, which Gompers opposed; but he conveniently forgets to mention that this bill was initiated by the Socialist Party, to which the Left wing was still affiliated, and that the Miners' Union, of which he was an official, was virtually controlled by Socialists.

Consider the way Green misrepresents the A. F. of L.'s record on industrial unionism. He blithely gives the Federation an O.K., and makes the whole thing a very simple and uncontroversial matter. He says that in 1890 the United Mine Workers of America, as an industrial union, got its charter from the A. F. of L., and that then "the Federation formulated its policy of organizing and accepting either industrial or craft union basis as circumstances and conditions might indicate that one or the other was better for a particular group"; a policy which, he says, has been followed ever since. What a caricature of reality! From its foundation, the Federation has been dominated by craft unionists, who have spared no means to prevent the development of industrial unionism, although the consolidation and trustification of industry long ago made this type of organization literally a life-and-death question for labor. This is why a whole series of movements—I.W.W., Socialist Party, Communist Party, progressive trade unionists—fought relentlessly for more than a generation for industrial unionism, against the combined resistance of the top A. F. of L. leaders. The present-day struggle of the C.I.O. shows how necessary this fight has been. Even today the A. F. of L. craft union leaders have not been budged from their opposition to industrial unionism, as their "unity" proposals to split the C.I.O. unions according to crafts fully show.

* * *

Green also goes to extreme lengths of misrepresentation to give the A. F. of L. leaders a progressive record in regard to the organization of the unorganized. Thus, in 1933-34, he pictures tremendous (imaginary) efforts by the A. F. of L. top officials to organize the workers in the steel, auto, rubber and other mass production industries, and the great success that, he claims, came as a result of this work. This is all hog-wash, of course. The plain facts are that the organizational work done in this period of great strikes was carried on chiefly by the spontaneous action of the workers themselves, by the organized effort of the unions which later formed the C.I.O., and by the intense activities of unions under the leadership of the Communists. As for the A. F. of L. top leaders, they were distinctly a hindrance as they have been during every progressive advance of the masses. They checked the whole

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

organizational campaign by calling on the workers not to strike, by trying to force the mass production workers into obsolete craft unions, by foisting upon them such reactionary leadership as that of Tighe in the steel, and Dillon in the auto industries, and by steering their movements (steel and auto notably) into government boards which cut them to pieces. It was precisely because the A. F. of L. leaders, in line with their traditional craft policy, refused to organize the unorganized masses of workers that the C.I.O. came into existence. Typically, Green, although claiming great credit for organizational activity on the part of the A. F. of L., does not even mention the decisive fact that at least 3,000,000 workers have been organized as a result of the C.I.O. campaigns.

Mr. Green makes many similar distortions of labor history, in order to prove his impossible point—that the A. F. of L. leaders are progressive. Among such distortions are his glossing over the Gompers clique's betrayal of the workers during the World War, his misrepresentation of the disastrous New Wage Policy of the Coolidge period, his ignoring the gangsterism and racketeering that has digraced A. F. of L. official circles, etc.

* * *

Having given the A. F. of L. leadership a progressive front, to his own satisfaction at least, especially with regard to matters of social legislation, industrial unionism, and the organization of the unorganized, Green assumes that he has destroyed any possible legitimate basis for the existence of the C.I.O. He then proceeds to reduce the whole controversy between the C.I.O. and the A. F. of L. to a matter of union "democracy." He repeats the false A. F. of L. charge that the split was precipitated because the C.I.O. unions, especially John L. Lewis personally, violated the principles of majority rule. Green's idyllic picture of the tender culture of democracy by the A. F. of L. leaders cannot fail to bring a smile to anyone who knows how autocratically ruled the A. F. of L. actually is. It is a safe bet that if there were any way by which rank-and-file members of the A. F. of L. unions could vote on the policies and leadership of their national federation, they would create an entirely new set-up. But Green and his fellow "democrats" carefully see to it that the membership will get no such chance if they can possibly prevent it.

Union officials holding office from year to year without elections or conventions; racketeers exploiting union official posts to fatten their private bank accounts; Matthew Woll acting as propagandist-in-chief in the A. F. of L. for reactionary business elements, and, without rank-and-file mandate, voting to exclude the Soviet trade unions from the Amsterdam International; Green and others echoing employers' wishes by ceaselessly carrying on a slander campaign against the U.S.S.R.—these are a few examples of the A. F. of L. Executive Council's practice of "union democracy."

Green gives a curious example of his conception of democracy by the very style of his book. Mussolini himself would hardly present the

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

leadership of Italian fascism more as a one-man affair than Green does that of the A. F. of L. All through the book Green talks of himself ceaselessly and of the various policies he has proposed and executed. Hardly anybody else comes into the picture, even for formal mention. Probably half his book deals with the history of the U.M.W.A.; yet, besides himself, the only other prominent labor officials named are John P. White and, of course, the chief devil, John L. Lewis. Mr. Green, in dealing with the A. F. of L., makes no mention whatever of such figures as Woll, Hutcheson, Frey, Morrison and the hundreds of other officials of the A. F. of L. and its constituent unions. Even Gompers is passed over with formal praise and a few uncomplimentary remarks.

Green presents no serious outline of demands or plan of action for organized labor. He says that democracy must be preserved and that this can be done only if the unions are fully recognized by the employers and the government. Beyond this generality he does not go. He gives us no definite economic or political program, either for the present alleviation of existing social evils or for their final abolition. He presents no plan for worker-farmer-professional political cooperation; no means whereby unemployment may be solved, reaction beaten, and peace achieved. His book constitutes a plea for the workers to continue the A. F. of L. policy of trailing behind the capitalists, accepting what few crumbs may fall from their table. It is a perspective of deepening misery and hopeless servitude for the toiling masses. The book is an exhibition of the political bankruptcy of the A. F. of L. top leadership in these days of the profound crisis of the world capitalist system, when, as never before, it is imperative that the workers should have at the head of their unions leaders capable of understanding the interests of the working class and of fighting loyally to defend them.

WILLIAM Z. FOSTER

THE TRIUMPH OF SOCIALISM VERSUS THE FAILURE OF CAPITALISM

TWO SYSTEMS. By Eugene Varga. International Publishers, New York, 1939, 286 pages, $2.00.

THERE is hardly any disagreement among economists that the capitalist world is sick. Even the most orthodox bourgeois economists have to admit that there is something wrong with a system that is unable to find employment either for its equipment or its labor force. "Idle men and idle money" has become the perennial problem of both theoretical and practical capitalist economics.

Virgil Jordan, President of the National Industrial Conference Board, the research institution of Big Business in the United States, diagnoses the alarming state of ill health of American capitalism since 1929 in the following manner:

"For ten years, the strongest and richest people of the world have been standing still, or slipping backward. We have not only been growing poorer as a nation, but weaker

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

as a people. An immeasurable amount of wealth has been wasted or uncreated, immense human and material resources have been dissipated and unrealized. The prodigious creative power and productive capacity of a great people have been demoralized, crippled and paralyzed, by confusion, conflict, corruption and fear." *

No amount of flowery oratory can disguise the fact that the confusion, conflict, corruption and fear, referred to by Dr. Jordan, are inherent in capitalism during its present imperialist-monopolistic stage of development.

In a message to Congress on April 29, 1938, President Roosevelt referred to some of the major failures of capitalism. Said the President:

"A recent study by the National Resources Committee shows that in 1935-36:

"Forty-seven per cent of all American families and single individuals living alone had incomes of less than $1,000 for the year.

"And at the other end of the ladder a little less than 1½ per cent of the nation's families received incomes which in dollars and cents reached the same total as the incomes of the 47 per cent at the bottom."

Not only does capitalism doom 47 per cent of the American people to a life of poverty and destitution, but the system is also a failure from the point of view of its much vaunted efficiency. As President Roosevelt put it in the same message:

"In output per man or machine we are the most efficient nation on earth.

"In the matter of complete mutual employment of capital and labor we are among the least efficient."

The most challenging manifestation of the inefficiency of capitalism is "idle men and idle money," and in both respects the United States takes first place among the advanced capitalist countries. American statistics on unemployment are sadly deficient, since there are no official statistics. The estimates of the National Industrial Conference Board generally accepted by bourgeois economists, cannot be considered otherwise than underestimates.* But even according to these figures, unemployment during the decade 1929-38 averaged no less than 16.3 per cent of the total labor force of the country. It could be easily shown by making the necessary corrections in the figures of the National Industrial Conference Board that the percentage of idleness during the decade exceeded 20 per cent. In Great Britain, according to official figures, the percentage of unemployed during the same period amounted to 15.9 per cent** of the total labor force, and the percentage was smaller in Germany.

As to idle money, it will be suf-

* *Problems of Economic Reconstruction*, pp. 6-7. National Industrial Conference Board, New York, May 24, 1939.

* How greatly the figures of the National Industrial Conference Board underestimate the real number of unemployed could be easily shown by the fact that according to those figures, the total number of unemployed in 1929 was 469,000, while according to the evidence submitted by the Commissioner of Labor Statistics of the U.S.A. to the Temporary National Economic Committee, the number of unemployed in 1929 was about 2,000,000. (See *Commerce Reports*, U. S. Department of Commerce, No. 16, Dec. 10, 1938, p. 330.)

** *National Conference Board Bulletin*, December 19, 1938, p. 117, Table IX.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ficient to quote the following summary of an investigation by the National Industrial Conference Board:

"The amount of money lying practically idle is greater today than at any previous time in our history. . . . The proportion of loans to our total deposits and net capital funds average 39 per cent for the last five years, against 63 per cent for the preceding eleven years."*

In other words, the portion of the total money-capital doomed to idleness by capitalism in the United States reached during the last five years the staggering amount of 60 per cent.

The further the capitalism of a country has advanced in the imperialist-monopolistic stage of its development, the greater is its inefficiency in the sense of inability to utilize its capital and labor force.

* * *

The United States is not the only capitalist country that is unable to find employment for its capital and labor. With an abundance of carefully analyzed statistics, Professor Eugene Varga shows in the book under review that the entire capitalist world has been unable to supply adequate employment either for its industrial apparatus or for its workers.

"Capital," says Varga, "is no longer in a position either to utilize the productive forces it has created or to give to the proletariat opportunity for work."

The book brings together statistics, quotes chapter and verse from official capitalist sources, to prove this thesis to the satisfaction of any reader willing to face the facts as they are.

Two major questions arise in connection with this admitted failure of the capitalist system. The average citizen wants to know, in the first place, whether this failure is not merely a temporary crisis due to some special passing conditions; in the second place, he wants to know, even assuming the permanent nature of the failure of capitalism, whether there is any better system available that has actually been tested and found more serviceable? This is the second major topic of Varga's *Two Systems*. The book not only proves the inherent failure of capitalism; it also shows the triumph of the socialist system in the Soviet Union. Step by step, Varga analyzes all the major economic functions, in each case proving conclusively the superiority of the socialist system of economics over the capitalist system. This second thesis is really the crux of this important volume; for it points the way toward the solution of the incurable economic ills of the greater part of the world, the part which still languishes under capitalism.

Bourgeois economists are wont to refer to the abolition of capitalism not as the abolition of a perverse system of social relationships, but as the destruction of capital, of the actual means of production. In a radio discussion of the question, "Can Capitalism Survive a War?" conducted by the Chicago University Forum on December 10, this was one of the several definitions of the "destruction" of capitalism. *Two Systems* shows the utter absurdity

* *Ibid.*, No. 4, Feb. 9, 1939.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of confusing capitalism as a social system with capital as the means of production which, of course, are necessary under any economic system.

The first chapter, "Capitalist Accumulation and Socialist Accumulation," demonstrates the superiority of socialism over capitalism in the accumulation of the means of production.

The socialist system in the Soviet Union has eliminated the immense wastefulness of capitalist production resulting from the incomplete utilization of capital and labor, recurrent crises, extravagant enervating super-luxury consumption and health-undermining under-consumption, wasteful advertising and cumbersome distributing apparatus.

A few figures supplied by the reviewer will show the extent of the wastefulness of capitalist distribution as compared with distribution under socialism. According to the rather conservative estimate of the Twentieth Century Fund the cost of advertising in the United States amounted to the enormous total of $2,000,000,000 in 1937. What is more important, out of every dollar spent by the consumers of the United States 59 cents went to cover the cost of distribution, while only 41 cents went for production.* Twelve and one-half per cent of the gainfully employed in the United States in 1930 were engaged in trade, and an additional 8.2 per cent were engaged in clerical occupations, making a total of almost 21 per cent.** In the U.S.S.R. the total number of people engaged in trade in 1935 amounted to but 1,802,000 or less than 3 per cent of the total gainfully employed population.*

In other words, the cost of distribution counted by the proportion of the total labor force engaged in it is practically seven times higher under capitalism in the United States than under socialism in the U.S.S.R.

The U.S.S.R. has accordingly succeeded in accelerating many times the slow rate of accumulation prevailing in capitalist countries. In fact, the accumulation of capital, *i.e.*, of means of production, in the Soviet Union has been so rapid that "without foreign loans, without giving the slightest possibility to foreign capital to exploit the workers of the Soviet Union, in fifteen years the transformation of the Soviet Union from a backward agricultural country into a modern highly industrial country has been completed."

There are data in *Two Systems* to show that while the production of the means of production in the Soviet Union grew eightfold in ten years, 1925-1934, it remained at about the same level in the big capitalist countries. The same holds true with regard to the national income, which grew fourfold in the Soviet Union, while increasing only by a few per cent in the capitalist countries.

The utilization of the industrial

* Paul W. Stewart & J. Frederic Dewhurst, *Does Distribution Cost Too Much?* pp. 117, 123, 226. The Twentieth Century Fund, New York, 1939.

** *Recent Social Trends in the United States.* Report by the President's Research Committee on Social Trends, p. 281. Whittlesey House, New York, 1933.

* *Trud v. SSSR* (*Labor in the U.S.S.R.*) Central Office of Economic Statistics, Moscow, 1936, p. 11.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

equipment of the United States during the ten-year period of 1925-1934 averaged only 67.5 per cent of capacity. On a similar basis of calculation, Germany utilized its capital during the period 1929-1936 only to the extent of less than 53 per cent of capacity. In the Soviet Union, on the other hand, the industrial equipment, or the capital of the country, has been utilized practically to its full capacity. One concrete example: the electric power stations in the U.S.S.R. worked on the average 4,570 hours a year, while in the U.S.A. they worked only 2,273 hours a year. Similar examples are quoted from other industries.

The socialist system is also greatly superior to capitalism in the rate of increase of labor productivity. From 1919 to 1936 the output of manufacturing industry of the United States increased by about 3 per cent per annum per employed worker, while the output per man-hour increased by about 4.4 per cent per annum. In the Soviet Union the increase in labor productivity during the period 1928 to 1936 amounted to 12.4 per cent per annum.* To be sure, the output of the individual worker in the Soviet Union in many cases still lags behind that of the workers in the most advanced capitalist countries, like the United States. There is no doubt, however, that notwithstanding the fact that industrial development in the U.S.S.R. began only a short time ago, it is rapidly overtaking the most advanced countries of the capitalist world.

Even at present, the productivity of some Stakhanovite workers, the vanguard of Soviet labor, already exceeds that of the workers in the most advanced capitalist countries. Maintaining its present rate of increase of labor productivity, the Soviet Union is bound, within a comparatively short time, to surpass the most advanced capitalist countries in this field as well.

* * *

An interesting chapter is devoted to unemployment. Not only is employment in capitalist countries declining in relation to the immense accumulation of capital, but during the post-War period, it has also declined absolutely. The number of wage earners employed in American manufacturing industry in 1929, the year of greatest capitalist prosperity, was less than ten years earlier: 8,822,000 wage earners in 1929 as against 9,041,000 in 1919. The official figures quoted by Varga show that the claim of the Nazis that they have "liquidated unemployment" in the course of their so-called first four-year plan is a sheer fraud. Varga demonstrates that in January, 1937, there were in Germany at least 3,850,000 unemployed. While the entire capitalist world continues to an ever greater extent to bend under the burden of increasing chronic unemployment even during periods of prosperity, a burden that during periods of depression grows to catastrophic proportions, unemployment has been entirely eliminated under the socialist system in the Soviet Union.

Space limitations will not permit us to dwell on the interesting chap-

* *SSSR i Kapitalisticheskiye Strani* (*The U.S.S.R. and Capitalist Countries*), p. 76. Moscow, Gosplanisdat, 1939.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ters devoted to the dislocation of the world markets under capitalism, the development of tendencies toward isolation and autarchy, the devaluation of currencies with its effects upon increasing the rate of exploitation and dislocating the entire sphere of commodity circulation.

The chapter dealing with agriculture, this sick industry in a sick capitalist world, and the contrast drawn by the author between retrogressing capitalist agriculture and the healthy, progressing collectivized agriculture of the Soviet Union deserves special attention. While the great majority of the farmers in capitalist countries are impoverished, reduced to a state of tenancy and sharecropping, depending increasingly for their very existence on government subsidies and relief, with no security today and no promise for tomorrow, the Soviet peasantry has been entirely relieved of any feeling of insecurity, has been transformed into cooperative cultivators of the soil, using the most modern machinery, technique and scientific methods, and has been elevated to a higher level of education and culture. In fact, the gulf dividing city and country under capitalism has been bridged under socialism. The difference between collective farmers and industrial workers in the Soviet Union is rapidly disappearing.

* * *

The chapters on national minorities and democracy will be of special interest to the reader during the present second imperialist war, when the capitalist press has again let loose a veritable flood of propaganda in an attempt to delude the people into believing that this is a war in behalf of the independence of small nations and of democracy.

Varga supplies unchallengeable facts showing the double exploitation of the colonial and semi-colonial countries by the native and foreign ruling classes. In contrast, he also shows the happy collaboration of the many nations living on the great territory of the Soviet Union, each enjoying equal rights, equal economic and social position, and full national self-determination; each receiving the cooperation of all other nationalities in the development of its particular national cultural life, as well as in the development of the socialist land as a whole. This cooperation is based on the new proletarian democracy, the democracy embodied in the Stalin Constitution, having as its foundation the abolition of exploitation of man by man, the elimination of unemployment and insecurity, the guarantees to every citizen of the opportunity to work, leisure and education.

The book under review contains interesting data on the relative and absolute impoverishment of the proletariat in the capitalist world. It shows, for instance, that the reduction in the standard of living of the workers of Germany under fascism from 1933 to 1937, according to official Nazi statistics, has amounted to between 25 per cent and 33 per cent. Detailed data on the condition of the workers in Japan, China and in colonial and semi-colonial countries, are extremely enlightening. The author also cites data collected by the

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Brookings Institution showing the destitution and misery of American workers, especially during crises. In contrast, he supplies an authentic picture of the constantly improving conditions of the working class of the U.S.S.R.

The average annual wage of Soviet workers increased from 450 rubles in 1924-25 to 2,765 rubles in 1936.* The hours of labor for all workers have been reduced on the average to 6.8 hours a day. Universal education has been introduced. All possible hazards have been provided for. The worker is insured, without any expense on his part, against illness, incapacity, etc.; he gets free medical treatment, vacations with pay, etc.

Let us add to Varga's picture that, according to the National Resources Committee of the United States, for the year 1935-1936, 2,124,000 of the poorest families of the United States had an average income each of only $138 a year. At the other end of the social ladder, 5,387 families had an average income each of $204,000.* In other words, the income of the top layer of monopoly capitalists in the United States is 1,048 times greater than that of the poorest proletarian families.

In the U.S.S.R., with the increasing productivity of labor, with the continuously rising output of industry and rapidly increasing national income, the socialist economy has laid a firm foundation for its progress toward communism, the social order in which everyone will contribute according to his capacity and receive according to his needs.

THEODORE MILLER.

* By 1938 the average wage had increased to 3,467 rubles for the year. See *Pravda*, Aug. 28, 1939.

* *Consumers' Income of U. S.*, p. 6. National Resources Committee, Washington, D. C., 1938.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

New Books

A TEXTBOOK OF DIALECTICAL MATERIALISM

DAVID GUEST

"The best short study of dialectical materialism that has appeared in English," Professor J. D. Bernal says of this volume.

Its author, a brilliant young philosopher and mathematician, was killed in 1938, at the age of 27, fighting with the International Brigade in Spain. This Textbook arose out of lectures and correspondence classes which he gave in London at the Marx Memorial House, just before he enlisted with the British Battalion.

Cloth, 60c.

TRADE UNION FACTS

Labor Research Association

This booklet is intended for trade unionists and all those interested in the labor movement. Scores of lengthy books and government documents as well as official labor journals and convention proceedings contain scattered data on the labor movement. This booklet is an attempt to summarize and present in brief form many of these facts and figures.

Another vest-pocket handbook, 128 pages, 25c.

New Editions of—

FOUNDATIONS OF LENINISM, by Joseph Stalin . . 10c

IMPERIALISM, THE HIGHEST STAGE OF CAPITALISM by V. I. Lenin 30c

"LEFT-WING" COMMUNISM: AN INFANTILE DISORDER by V. I. Lenin 25c

---

WORKERS LIBRARY PUBLISHERS

P. O. Box 148, Station D, New York, N. Y.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

WORKS OF JOSEPH STALIN

Foundations of Leninism	paper $.10, cloth	$1.00
Problems of Leninism	paper $.25, cloth	1.00
Leninism, two volumes	each	1.90
Marxism and the National and Colonial Question		1.50
The October Revolution		1.00
The Russian Revolution by V. I. Lenin and Joseph Stalin		2.00

Pamphlets

From Socialism to Communism in the Soviet Union	.05
Mastering Bolshevism	.10
Marxism Versus Liberalism	.02
The Lenin Heritage	.03
The Road to Power	.05
The Stalin-Howard Interview	.02
Soviets and the Individual	.02
The Stakhanov Movement in the Soviet Union	.03
Stalin on the New Soviet Constitution	.02

A BOOK OF WORLD IMPORTANCE!

The History of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union (Bolsheviks)

Prepared under the direction of the Central Committee of the C.P.S.U., with the personal participation of Joseph Stalin.

384 pages. Price $1.00

Also available in Jewish, Italian, Spanish, French and Chinese.

WORKERS LIBRARY PUBLISHERS

P. O. Box 148, Station D, New York, N. Y.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

New Books

STALIN'S EARLY WRITINGS AND ACTIVITIES

ON THE HISTORY OF THE BOLSHEVIK ORGANIZATION IN TRANSCAUCASIA

By L. BERIA

This volume contains many facts regarding the early Bolshevik activities of Joseph Stalin, as organizer and leader of socialist groups in Transcaucasia from the age of seventeen (in 1896). One of the most valuable aspects of the present volume is the extensive series of quotations which it gives from early theoretical articles by Stalin.

Cloth, 75c

•

TWO SYSTEMS—Capitalist Economy and Socialist Economy

By EUGENE VARGA

This is a comparative survey of socialist and capitalist economy during the past two decades. Professor Varga shows the difference between the economic development of the leading capitalist countries and the construction of socialism in the Soviet Union. The volume is thoroughly documented with numerous statistical tables and other illustrative material.

$2.00

•

CULTURE AND THE PEOPLE

By MAXIM GORKY

This collection contains the last essays of Gorky, and is a representative selection from the voluminous publicist efforts in which the author was engaged during the last ten years of his life.

The present volume reveals a side of Gorky's writings as necessary for understanding of his work as his novels, stories, autobiographical volumes and plays.

$1.50

WORKERS LIBRARY PUBLISHERS
P. O. Box 1148, Station D, New York, N. Y.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED